The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIV, No. 2 February, 1946

CONTENTS

Our Lady's Training for the Sacrifice of Separation
James A. Kleist, S.J. 81

Sakyamuni in the Land of Confucius
Thaddeus Yang, O.S.B. 90

A Liturgical Movement in the Middle Ages
Walter J. Ong, S.J. 104

Brownson and the Papacy . . *Thomas Ryan, C.PP.S.* 114

Grievance—Part III . . . *Thomas Owen Martin* 123

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Chaplain's Faculty 136

A Doctor's Co-operation 137

Which Debt Should Be Paid? 139

Candles and Candlesticks 140

The Chalice in the Hands of the Corpse 141

St. Anastasia on Christmas Day 141

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Sisters as Congregational Choir Leaders 142

The Standing *versus* the Hanging Crucifix 143

ANALECTA 144

BOOK REVIEWS

Rufinus of Aquileia, *by Francis X Murphy, C.SS.R.* . . 147

Religion in the Post-War World, *Edited by Willard L. Sperry* 149

Augustine's Quest of Wisdom, *by Vernon J. Bourke* . . 151

Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel *by F. R. Hoare* 153

Pastoral Spanish, *by Alphonse Simon, O.M.I.* . . . 157

BOOK NOTES 158

BOOKS RECEIVED 159

For the Sacristy and the Sanctuary

Manual of

Forty Hours' Adoration

THIS Manual Contains LITANIAE ET PRECES: the Approved Music for "Te Deum" and "Tantum Ergo," and everything requisite for the Devotion—Ceremonies, Rubrics and Prayers.

Order copies now, so that they will be on hand when needed, as they are sure to be.

Twenty-five cents per copy.
Five copies, one dollar

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

When the Bishop comes, it is well to have at hand the

Manual of

Episcopal Visitation and Sacrament of Confirmation

Full and detailed information, both for the ceremony of Confirmation and for the Bishop's official visit. All the canonical prescriptions minutely explained. Indispensable for the occasion.

Twenty-five cents per copy
Five copies, one dollar

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

OUR LADY'S TRAINING FOR THE SACRIFICE OF SEPARATION

"Esse sine Iesu, gravis est infernus: et esse cum Iesu, dulcis paradisus," says Thomas à Kempis. If it was Mary's keenest joy in life to be with Jesus, it must have been her keenest pain to be deprived of His presence. But the sacrifice of separation had to be made, and it is interesting to see by what gentle steps she was trained for it. There are two incidents in the Gospels which throw light on this phase of her spiritual advancement; first, the Child's remaining in the temple; second, the wedding feast at Cana.

The striking feature of the temple episode is the Child's absenting Himself without the knowledge and consent of His parents. "After spending there the required number of days, they prepared to return home, but the Child Jesus remained behind without His parents knowing anything about it." Surely, we should think, He might have informed them of His intention to tarry a while in the temple after their visit, and thus have spared them much "sorrowing." But no; by the will of the Father the moment had arrived when Mary must be given a first inkling[1] of the final separation which was inevitable. Her beloved Jesus was not to be for ever under her maternal jurisdiction. For once, the calm tenor of the hidden life is sharply interrupted; for once, though still her Child, Jesus rises to the full stature of manhood; for once, the parental jurisdiction is receding from the clear-cut childish horizon and melting away into that awful region of the Father's sovereign dominion over His Son. For a brief span of time, filled with pain for all concerned in this little drama, there is a foretaste of what must inevitably happen in due time when the Son of Mary leaves her home for good and ceases to be under her sweet rule. For that sacrifice Mary must be trained betimes; for, though His mother, she is also His disciple and must serve her apprenticeship in holiness. It was part of her training that the light she needed for her complete self-abandonment did not burst in upon her in one overwhelming flood, but was communicated in fitful gleams. Twelve years earlier, Simeon had aston-

[1] I do not say that this was the *only* reason for the Child's remaining in the temple when He was twelve years old.

ished her by predicting that a "sword" must pierce her soul. It was a vague prediction, and the venerable old man left it at that, without vouchsafing a further word of explanation. No doubt, the shadow of the sword hung over all the happy days of Nazareth; but then—there was no hint as yet of separation from Jesus. On the contrary, the words "Your own soul *also* shall be pierced by a sword" seemed to imply that her suffering, whatever it might be, would be coupled with that of Jesus, and not undergone apart from Him.

The exegesis of *Luke* 2:41-52 has been at times needlessly complicated by the assumption that Mary spoke to Jesus the moment she laid her eyes on Him in the presence of the learned doctors of the law. Besides, some exegetes find in Mary's words an accent of reproach and see in them an outburst of uncontrolled motherly feeling.[2] But the first assumption cannot be proved from the Greek. The use of "and" in joining sentences is no sure basis for chronological speculation. How much time elapsed between Mary's "seeing" Jesus *and* "speaking" to Him, or whether any time at all intervened, cannot with certainty be gathered from the use of "and." The two actions may lie far apart.

Nor is the second assumption better founded. It is *opinio communissima* among Catholics that Mary was not subject to even involuntary imperfections. Really, can we bring ourselves to believe that the *virgo prudentissima*, the moment she saw Jesus, rushed forward and hurriedly spoke words of reproach to Him in the presence of the learned men and the group surrounding them? It has been remarked that such impetuousness was characteristic of Jewish mothers in dealing with their children. But Mary was not an ordinary Jewish mother, and Jesus was not an ordinary Jewish child. No; she could not speak "in undisguised excitement and in a tone of reproach"[3] to One whom she knew to be the Messias and the Son of God.

[2] Knabenbauer: "Haec verba *non* sunt cum S. Bonaventura dicenda *corripientis* matris." The same author's further comment is unintelligible to me: "Sunt, qui putaverint haec matrem dixisse cum dimissis doctoribus *solus* esset cum parentibus puer (Iansenius, Maldonatus, Toletus, a Lapide). Sed dubito num recte . . . Dein *affectus* quoque *vehementia* suadetur matrem *simul ac filium viderit* in ea *prorupisse* verba."

[3] Theodor Zahn: "In unverkennbarer Erregung und im Ton de Vorwurfs" (*Das Evangelium des Lucas*: 4te Aufl. [Leipzig: Deichert, 1920], p. 167).

Let us try to picture the scene to ourselves. Mary and Joseph are looking for Jesus. They are "sorrowing," for the privation of His radiant presence is a pang to their parental hearts. Then, there is that harrowing uncertainty of what may possibly have befallen Him. Lastly, a sense of self-reproach may have touched their grief; for, after all, had they really been watching over Him with the care due to His person? True love is ready to assume all blame. Suddenly, on the third day, they discover Him in one of the temple halls. There He is—alive, and well, and honored by learned men, and admired by all "for His intelligence and His answers." What mother's heart, I ask, is capable, in so blissful a moment, of anything but unbounded joy? "On seeing Him, they were overjoyed—they were in a transport of joy." This, and no other, rendering will do justice to the Greek.[4] And so, as it were in a trance, they patiently wait for "the catechism class" (Knox) to break up; and then the Child rushed into His Mother's arms.

But, of course, Mary's question must be cleared up. How could she ask *why* the Child had thus behaved when she well knew that she had no right to question the perfect propriety of her Son's behavior? There is a clue to the answer in three passages in the same chapter (verses 19, 33, and 51), all pointing to the same fact and in identical words. Beginning with our Lord's infancy, Mary had been eager to learn as much as she could about the Child's nature and mission. It did her "heart" good to ponder over every step, so to say, in this Child's life, and profit by such pondering. To enter into our Lord's mind and advance in holiness—that was her heart's desire. When others listened to the shepherds' account as they made known what had been told them by the angel, they were content to "wonder." Not so Mary: "She treasured all these incidents in heart and mind and meditated on them." Now, when the Child was twelve years old, and acted in so unexpected a manner, she felt that there was a mystery here—something the knowledge of which might profit her. And so, since Jesus did not volunteer an explanation, nothing remained for her but to inquire. Waiting, therefore, as we may well assume with Maldonatus, Toletus, a Lapide and others, for a quiet moment, on their way home perhaps, or even after their return to Nazareth, she asked in accents of eager expectation:

[4] Cf. Liddell and Scott, s. v., II, 2. See my explanation in *The Gospel of St. Mark* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1937), p. 165.

"My Child, why did you behave toward us in just this way? Oh, our hearts were heavy—your father's and mine—as we looked for you." To which He replied: "Why did you look for me? I had to be ready to answer my Father's call—and you did not know it?" There was abundant consolation in the reply;[5] for now Mary knew that neither she nor Joseph had been negligent in watching over Him. It was consoling to know that He had been in His Father's House and doing what the Father had assigned Him. But, it must be confessed, there was a remnant of uncertainty in the reply which was not wholly cleared up. What Mary wished to know was, why the Father had withdrawn Him, on this occasion, from the control of His parents without their knowledge. For us who can look back on the life of Christ, the answer seems easy: Jesus was hers, but not wholly hers; and at some time in the future the Father would claim Him wholly as His own: *to prepare her by degrees for the great sacrifice He gives her now this important lesson.* It is not without significance that St. Luke, after saying that Jesus went back to Nazareth in the company of His parents to resume His normal life, reminds us again of Mary's habit of reflecting on the lessons of this episode. The lesson came to Mary with something of a shock. At this we need not be surprised. Suffering is a universal law. Do not we also learn some of life's most valued lessons by what we style "a rude awakening"? Mary was not exempt from this law.[6] It was her way of advancing in holiness. Mary was neither omniscient nor dispensed from the need of suffering as a means of advancing in perfection.

An explanation such as this conflicts with nothing that we know to be a fact. It tallies with all we know of God's ways of dealing with His elect. Jesus acted on this occasion not as Mary's Child, but as her Teacher. Mary was still in training. She was His mother and disciple.

The eighteen years or so which now followed were a period of

[5] Lagrange is right: "Jésus répond *en souriant.*" The Greek may also be rendered "I am surprised you looked for me. But alas, you *could not know* that I had to be about my Father's business!" If this is correct, Jesus exonerates His parents from all blame.

[6] Lagrange: "Si Jésus sur le Croix a dû subir l'abandon de son Père pourquoi l'âme de Marie n'aurait-elle pas connu des épreuves mystérieuses qui la plongeaient dans une sorte d'obscurité?"

unbroken happiness. Not that the cloud of uncertainty was wholly lifted from Mary's mind—but, at any rate, the presence and obedience of Jesus sweetened everything. A notable change in the daily routine of the Holy House occurred only when Jesus left to enter upon His public ministry. But, even so, there was consolation in His departure, for He was at least within easy reach. In fact, mother and Son were soon to meet in the neighboring town of Cana where both were guests at a wedding feast.

It was on this festive occasion that two memorable sayings were uttered. When the supply of wine was running low, Mary said to Jesus: "They have no wine." And Jesus replied: "Woman, what is that to me and you? My hour is not yet come." I wish to offer two comments on this scene.

First, the phrase "What is that to me and you?" should cause no difficulty. Its basic meaning has long been known to scholars: it is an expression which deprecates undue interference. As such it may be harsh or kind, according to the context. Addressed to a meddlesome slave, uttered in a forbidding tone of voice, and accompanied by a stern look or gesture, it could be a withering reprimand: "Mind your own business!" When used by demons in speaking to Jesus, the phrase is a curious mixture of indignation and submission. There is nothing of all this in the Cana episode. Mary was not "meddlesome" when she told Jesus of the embarrassment of the young couple, though some of the Fathers were not altogether edified by her conduct.[7] What counts for more than her sympathy with her friends is her lively faith in her Son's ability and willingness to help even by a miracle. Mary's statement, "They have no wine," was made with the same tactful delicacy which prompted the sisters of Lazarus to appeal for help in the simple words: "He whom Thou lovest is sick."

For all that, there is something in her statement that needed correction. Jesus had now arrived at a point in His career where her motherly jurisdiction was at an end; He was now unconditionally subject to the will of the Father; and the Father had ordained, at least provisionally, that the first miracle was to take place under other circumstances. It is this perception that Mary had not yet acquired, and this was the time in God's design to

[7] Lagrange quotes Irenaeus: "Dominus repellens eius intempestivam festinationem."

impart it to her. Eighteen years earlier a first lesson was given her; the present homely and unobtrusive circumstances were chosen *to complete her training*: she must now learn definitely that, during her Son's public ministry, she must stand aside. And yet, the remarkable thing in Christ's answer to Mary is, that though seemingly a flat refusal, it was actually the fullest possible compliance with her request. Mary inwardly submitted to God's will thus made known to her, and many exegetes are of the opinion that this unreserved submission hastened her Son's "hour" and wrung from Him the miracle He had at first refused. This is possible, but I think the solution lies elsewhere. *Mary* had to be told that the motherly influence she had wielded over Jesus at Nazareth was now at an end, and *we* had to be made aware that her divine motherhood entitled her to the role, now inaugurated, of *our* heavenly mother and intercessor. This role of Mary as our Mother was more distinctly pointed out to us, if not perhaps to her, at the foot of the Cross, when she took the beloved disciple, and with him the whole human race, under her motherly protection; but a first anticipation of it was granted her even as early as the wedding feast of Cana. In God's family Mary is the divinely appointed mediatrix of all graces.

This interpretation is coherent in every detail. After our Lord's seeming refusal, Mary went to the waiters and told them to hold themselves in readiness for any order they might receive from Him. This action is unintelligible except on the supposition that, if His *words* implied refusal, His gracious look and the kindly accents of His voice were to her a positive assurance that the miracle would be granted after all.[8] Yes, Mary is here proclaimed, for all those who can read this account in the light of the Church's history, as the mediatrix of all graces, one of Mary's recognized titles in the Liturgy.

But a word must yet be said about γύναι as the form of address used on this occasion. The noun γυνή takes its color from the context. It does not necessarily imply want of respect, ranging as it does all the way from "wench" to "queen." In the vocative, γυνή occurs in Greek literature as an address to women in all stations of life: woman, wife, bride, widow, mistress, queen, etc. Its use as a term of respect or even affection is well established.

[8] On the whole, Lagrange's interpretation seems to me the most satisfactory.

It has been remarked, however, that its use on the present occasion carries a certain solemnity: "Il y a ici de la solennité" (Lagrange). Jesus is here speaking to Mary, not in her capacity as mother in the home of Nazareth, but as a creature face to face with her Creator, or at least one who is acting under direct orders from the Father. This would account for His assuming a certain solemn tone in speaking to her. How is one to bring this out in a modern English translation? "Femme" may do very well in French, and "lady" in England. The latter is, I think, impossible in our American conditions of life; it sounds stilted, stiff, and cold. And as for "woman," there is a certain rudeness or brusqueness in it which is not called for under the circumstances. I think, however, that this defect may be remedied if we modify the noun somewhat, as, for instance, by saying "my good woman," for this, when spoken by a person of superior rank to a woman in an inferior station, who is yet entitled to his respect, avoids the unpleasant connotation of rudeness. It would here remind Mary that the old familiarity of Nazareth is now a matter of the past, and yet allow of enough respect and even affection which is natural when a son speaks to his mother. Perhaps the address gave Mary a slight shock; but this was no greater than that given her by what follows: "Leave that to *me!*" The moment had to come when Mary must be shown her place in the altered circumstances in our Lord's career.

And yet, I am not sure that the rendering "Mother" would not also be defensible. The difficulty in dealing with γύναι is here no greater than in *John* 19: 26, where Jesus, on the point of leaving His *Mother* in bereavement, consoles her by saying that hereafter the beloved disciple would be *son* to her, and that she would be *mother* to him. The present occasion is somewhat analogous: as I showed above, Mary is here pointed out to us as *our Mother*, and the miracle is granted precisely because, by reason of her divine *Motherhood*, she was hereafter to wield *motherly* influence as our intercessor.

When all is said, some such form as "My good woman" may perhaps seem best suited to the occasion, provided enough emphasis falls both on the word *woman* and on the pronoun *me*, since the contrast is between these two persons and the specific stations in the life now confronting both.

The interpretation just given lays stress on the indubitable

fact that Jesus wrought the miracle at the intercession of Mary. And it is interesting to find that the evangelist himself was impressed with this aspect of the incident; for he concludes his narrative with a statement of its significance: "Jesus made *this the beginning of His signs*, and He made it at Cana in Galilee; He revealed His glory, and His disciples believed in Him." What a glory for Mary that the first of the signs was wrought in deference to her motherly wishes! John penned these lines toward the end of his long life, somewhere in the nineties of the first century. Fifty years had elapsed since the Lord's Ascension, and half a century of Church history lay behind him. In retrospect on the life of Christ and the history of the Church, he knew that the Lord had wrought many other signs in the interval: does he, perhaps, mean to imply that the intercession of Mary was responsible also for some at least of these other signs? We do not know; but it seems natural that in the course of fifty years many an early Christian should appeal to the mother for help while she lived in the household of the beloved disciple. At all events, the total upshot of this first sign is something the disciple refers to in explicit terms: "He revealed (by it) His glory, and His disciples believed in Him." Here, then, we have scriptural proof for the fact that honor shown to Mary, the intercessor,[9] does not derogate from the honor due to Jesus. Quite the contrary: as the first miracle wrought at Cana resulted in showing forth the glory of Jesus and increasing the faith of the disciples, so throughout the history of the Church, whenever Mary hears the prayers of her children, she positively contributes to the glory of Christ.[10]

For all those, therefore, who believe in Christ and in the position Mary occupies in the Church, verse 11 is the crowning verse of the Cana Episode.

I began this paper by saying that the two events here discussed were a school of training in which Mary was being prepared for

[9] It is possible that the bridal couple told Mary of their embarrassment, and possible, too, that they asked Mary to "intercede" for them. It is certain Mary's statement, "They have no wine," was virtually an intercession. Remember *John* 11:3.

[10] The raising of Lazarus produced the same result: "Many of the Jews believed in Him." All our Lord's miracles were "signs," that is, "proofs" of His claim to be the Messias and the Son of God.

the sacrifice of separation from Jesus. Her apprenticeship is now complete: during her Son's subsequent career she plays the part of a keenly interested, yet distant, observer.[11] For three long years she is cut off from His society, and she bears her burden nobly. Her training had ripened her soul for sacrifice. Of course, the real great sacrifice of separation was yet to come when her Son departed this world and returned to the Father. It is not within the scope of this essay to enter into Mary's mind during the many years she spent "sine Iesu" in the home of the beloved disciple. But we may be sure she was now more than ever, and in a deeper and more exalted sense, "cum Iesu." To speak of this last period in Mary's life as a term of separation does not exhaust its meaning. Not only was there the daily "breaking of the bread" for her, but also, no doubt, the fullness of mystical experience. Even in her state of exile, she realized that "esse cum Iesu dulcis paradisus est."

St. Louis University,
St. Louis, Mo.

JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

[11] The incident narrated in *Mark* 3:21 is no disproof of this statement.

A GLORIOUS CENTENNIAL WITHIN THE AMERICAN CHURCH

We take this occasion, brethren, to communicate to you the determination, unanimously adopted by us, to place ourselves, and all entrusted to our charge throughout the United States, under the special patronage of the holy Mother of God, whose immaculate conception is venerated by the piety of the faithful throughout the Catholic church. By the aid of her prayers, we entertain the confident hope that we will be strengthened to perform the arduous duties of our ministry, and that you will be enabled to practice the sublime virtues, of which her life presents a most perfect example. The Holy Ghost, by her own lips, has foretold that all generations shall call her blessed; and we can not doubt that a blessing is attached to those who take care to fulfill this prediction. To her, then, we commend you, in the confidence that, through the one Mediator of God and men, the man Jesus Christ, who gave himself a redemption for all, she will obtain for us grace and salvation.

—The Pastor Letter of the American Prelates, assembled for the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore, and dated on the fifth Sunday after Easter, 1846. From *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy* (1792-1919), with a Foreword, Notes, and Index by Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph.D. (Washington: NCWC, 1923), pp. 168 f.

SAKYAMUNI IN THE LAND OF CONFUCIUS

In July, 1927, an elderly Chinese gentleman knocked at the door of the Abbaye de Saint-André, near Bruges, in Belgium. His French was flawless and elegant, as if French were his mother tongue. His fashionable and expensive dress contrasted singularly with the humility and meekness of his countenance.

This gentleman was His Excellency Mr. J. R. Lou Cheng-Hsiang, former Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China. He came to the Abbaye de Saint-André at the invitation of the author, then a novice at the abbey. And he did not come for a weekend, nor for a retreat. Following the example of his young countryman who had forsaken Buddha Sakyamuni for Christ Jesus, and Buddhist asceticism for Christian monastic life, he had decided to abandon worldly honors and wealth and devote himself to meditation and contemplation under the Rule of St. Benedict. Ordained a priest at the age of 65, Mr. Lou is known today under the religious name of Dom Peter-Celestine, O.S.B., a name reminiscent of both the See of St. Peter and the Celestial Empire which he had served with unflinching zeal, loyalty, and intelligence.

To a group of Benedictine missionaries who were about to leave for West China, Father Peter-Celestine said one day: "There are people who claim that everything Chinese is good and praiseworthy; for others, still more numerous, anything Chinese is ugly and despicable. Both are prejudiced and wrong. In China as anywhere else in the world, are good and bad things, virtuous people and people whose honesty is more than doubtful. Your main duty as missionaries in China is to perfect what is good and straighten what is evil . . ."

It is the author's intention to point out some of the things that are really worthwhile in China. He will stress, more especially, the way the common people of China carry out the fundamental doctrines of Confucius and Buddha in their everyday lives. This essay is based mainly on the author's personal experience and observations.

China, as everybody knows, is larger than the United States in area as well as in population. According to the official figures of 1944, it is divided into twenty-eight provinces with a total

area of 8,745,764 square kilometers; to these provinces should be added the so-called "Special Territories" of Mongolia and Tibet, whose area is 1,621,201 and 1,215,788 square kilometers, respectively. China's total population is estimated at 450,000,000 inhabitants, or practically four times that of the United States. And this population increases every day, for the Chinese have a natural desire to bring up children. There are three things that, according to the Chinese, constitute supreme happiness in this world: wealth, public honors, and children—many children. A family without children is considered unfortunate.

The vastness of China's territory and population explains the variety of climates, customs, and dialects. There are four principal dialects in China: the Cantonese, Fukienese, Ningponese and Shanghai dialects. But these dialects are spoken only in four provinces, namely, Kwangtung, Fukien, Chekiang, and Kiangsu. And even in these provinces all educated people can understand and speak Mandarin, the national language, the study of which is compulsory in all schools throughout China.

The main, if not the only, factor that facilitates the diffusion of Mandarin is the unity of the written language. All over China —from North to South, from East to West—Chinese is written exactly the same way.

Chinese writing is ideographic or pictorial. We have no alphabet. Each individual sign is a whole word. The oldest signs we know date back to the Shang dynasty, around 1700 B.C. They are miniature drawings, akin to ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic. Through a slow process of evolution they have become mere conventional and abstract signs, with hardly anything in common with the original drawings. In the course of past centuries, the Chinese written language has been considerably enriched, and today it has approximately 50,000 words or characters.

Each character represents an idea. These characters are often as picturesque as they are profound. Let us take the word for "wealth" as a first example. It is represented by a jade under a roof, for jade is something precious that is not in everybody's possession. Nor is the dragon—a good transcendental being whose duty it is to give blessing to the hard-working farmers—possessed by every family. And so a dragon under a roof means, in Chinese, abundance of spiritual wealth. (The Catholics use this word as meaning "grace.") The chief possession of the

Chinese, an essentially agricultural people, is livestock. Thus, the very word "family" is composed of a pig under a roof. But there are families who don't even have pigs to boast of. They are poor—and the word for poor consists of a naked body and an arrow under a roof. With only an arrow and no clothing, one is evidently in dire poverty!

According to Chinese moral philosophy, the boys should work in the fields while the girls remain at home. That is why the word for boy is composed of strength and field; in the house the boy is supposed to study, and the word for writing or written word is consequently composed of a boy-child under a roof. As the duty of the girls is to remain at home, a girl under a roof means peace or tranquility. When the boys and girls get along together, peace and harmony reign within the family. Thus the word for good or well is represented by a boy and a girl put side by side.

In Chinese, many words are pronounced the same way. They are distinguishable only by the tones or inflections of the voice. These tones make the Chinese spoken language sound musical even to the uninitiated; in fact, it is on them that is based Chinese poetry, at least since the fifth century A.D. They are of extreme importance, too. A mistake in the inflection of the voice may lead to a disastrous *quid pro quo*. One day a young missionary wanted to have the national flag of his country hoisted. In Chinese the word flag is pronounced "ch'i" in the second tone; the word wife is also pronounced "ch'i," but in the first tone. To everybody's great surprise, the missionary said to his "boy": "Go and hang my wife!."

I have purposely chosen words connected with the idea of family, for the family is the center of gravity of Chinese social life and the *raison d'être* of almost all the activities of the Chinese. The Chinese does everything with the welfare of his family in mind. This is the result of two thousand six hundred years of Confucian teaching and practices.

Confucius—or Kung Fu-Tse (Master Kung) in Chinese—lived during one of the most turbulent periods of China's history. The Chou dynasty was falling to pieces, and China was divided into as many independent kingdoms as there are provinces today. The kings or chieftains, ignorant and rapacious, plunged the whole country into the darkest misery. Confucius, a wise statesman of the Kingdom of Lu (present-day Shantung), traveled

from kingdom to kingdom, preaching the virtuous deeds of the saintly emperors of old—Yao and Shun, Wen and Wu. His effort was of no avail. None of the rulers would listen to him. Some, respectful of his power, smiled politely as he talked; others arrogantly shrugged their shoulders. In his bitterness he settled down and wrote his "Spring and Autumn Annals," a critical record of all the vice and evil, the treachery, covetousness, and murders perpetrated in those sad days. In 478 B.C., at the age of seventy-three he passed away, murmuring this terrible anathema:

T'ai Mountain must crumble,
The strong beam must break,
And the wise man wither away.

Confucius' career was, therefore, a failure. But posterity has done him justice. No pagan moralist has exercised so great an influence over so long a period as Confucius. Until recent years the Confucian Classics were the only foundation of education in China. Children and grown-ups alike had to learn them by rote. An intimate knowledge of the Master's teaching was a sign of good breeding and brilliant mind. And even today this influence is still strongly felt among China's teeming millions. To show how the average Chinese practise Confucius' teaching, I beg the reader to let me take my own family as an example.

At home, my grandfather took the place of Confucius, whose moral doctrine he imparted to us, boys and girls, orally—sometimes by means of a bamboo stick, for we did not always do exactly what he wanted us to do. He encouraged us to become "chun-tse" or "gentlemen" by faithfully observing the so-called "duties of universal obligation," which are those "between sovereign and ministers, between father and son, between elder brother and the younger, between companion and friend," and by practising the virtues of benevolence, filial piety, prudence, fortitude, harmony, and peace, on which the "duties of universal obligation" are founded.

We could never argue with grandfather, although Confucius enjoyed arguing with his disciples Yen Hui, Tse Lu, Tse Kung, and others. Tse Lu even got Confucius into trouble once. While visiting in the capital of Chou, Confucius wanted to offer his books to the Imperial Library, but did not know whom to contact. "Why not go and see Lao Tan, the old librarian?" suggested Tse Lu. Lao Tan was a bulldog kind of man. "What do you

want?" he growled at Confucius. "I wish to offer my books to the Imperial Library," answered Confucius. "We don't need books," snapped the librarian, slamming the door behind Confucius.

By giving his advice to his Master, Tse Lu sinned against the virtue of prudence and made Confucius lose face. Yet Confucius did not scold him. A "gentleman" must be patient. In Confucius' place my grandfather would have acted differently. One day—it was during World War I—he was discussing the European situation with my father, when looking casually at the German Kaiser's picture in the local daily, I laughed and said, "Look at this strange foreigner. He has a moustache like a walrus!" Both grandfather and father were indignant, not because I laughed at Wilhelm II, but because I dared interrupt their conversation. "Get out from here at once," grandfather commanded, "or your mother will show you how to behave yourself!"

One might think my grandfather was like Lao Tan, the Imperial librarian of Chou. No, he was a kind-hearted old gentleman, but as an orthodox Confucianist he could not tolerate any breach of etiquette in the family. Being the oldest member of the family, he had to see to it that the "duties of universal obligation" were fulfilled, and that everything within the family was in perfect order—and order here means that the younger respects his elder, and all practise the greatest of all virtues, filial piety towards parents, grandparents and ancestors.

Like any other non-Christian Chinese family, ours keeps a family altar dedicated to the ancestors. It is at the same time a place of practical education and a place of worship. According to our Chinese conception, the ancestors are regarded as virtuous people whose lives we, their descendants, have to imitate in order to maintain the good name of the family for generation after generation. Their tablets are placed on the altar as a reminder lest we forget our duties as pious children. Enlightened Chinese do not worship their ancestors. They worship Heaven (T'ien), or the Supreme Ruler On High (Hao T'ien Shang Ti), or, more commonly, Heavenly Master (T'ien Lao Yeh). Heaven is a Supreme Being that rewards good and punishes evil. It is said of righteous emperor Wen that "his spirit dwells with Heaven." The wicked emperor Tsou was dethroned "by the will of Heaven"

and died miserably. Confucius said one day, "If I do wrong, let Heaven punish me, let Heaven punish me!"

Only the male members of the family are admitted to this so-called ancestor worship, for they alone can maintain the family name generation after generation. This explains the seeming inferiority of the girls. When a girl gets married, she takes up her husband's name, and a family without male children is rightly considered as unfortunate—for it is bound to disappear after one generation. That is why polygamy was not proscribed until the establishment of the Republic, thirty years ago.

Outside of this particular case of ancestor worship, within the close circle of the family the girls enjoy more freedom and are more respected than the boys. Even the devil, or malignant spirit, respects the girls more than the boys. Especially in West China, the common people believe that the devil is so anxious to see the extinction of the family name that he does all kinds of mischief in order to destroy male children. But parents, even smarter than the devil, can undo his tricks. In villages, parents who have only one male child often clothe him in such a way that the devil mistakes him for a girl—and at the sight of a girl, the devil covers his face and runs away.

My parents loved us very much, and there was deep affection among us brothers and sisters. But in a Chinese family affection is never shown in an exuberant way. Familiarity is almost always regarded as unbecoming, for familiarity often causes discord, and discord is the enemy of peace and harmony, two of the five Chinese cardinal virtues. Mutual respect governs all our relationship. I cannot call my brothers and sisters simply by their names, without the prefixes "elder brother" or "younger brother," "elder sister" or "younger sister." And as we were fourteen —eight boys and six girls—we used numbers, "third sister," "fourth sister," etc.

The same way, I cannot sit down while my elders are standing up, or start dinner before them, or argue with my parents, or use only one hand while delivering something to them or receiving something from them. In the street we have to walk like ducks —my grandfather first, my grandmother behind my grandfather, then my father behind my grandmother and my mother behind my father, and then my brothers and sisters in order behind them all.

This respect towards elders is extended to strangers. My grandfather would be shocked if he were to see a young foreigner hitting an elderly one on the back saying, "Hello, Jack, old boy!" He would feel hurt, too, if one of us, Chinese, young or old, should ask a stranger, "What is your name?" instead of, "What is your honorable name?" Or if, in answer, the stranger were to say, "My name is Wang," and not "The unworthy one is named Wang." This does not mean that we cannot crack jokes. My brothers, for example, were ferocious practical jokers. One day, during a game of cards organized after a dinner given by my eldest brother, my "second elder brother" sneaked behind three guests who were sitting side by side, tied up their "pigtails" together, and furtively walked away. When the three guests arose from the table they were greeted with frantic laughter. Sometimes we teased our sisters until they cried in despair. But as a rule it is bad manners to be too familiar with them, although they can always deal with us boys familiarly.

The bond of friendship between schoolmates—"companion and friend," says Confucius—is just as deep as between brothers and sisters. Schoolmates (that is, people who have been to the same school) are bound to help one another anywhere and at all times. This practice has its disadvantages. When my eldest brother was appointed chairman of the local Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) many years ago, he was morally obliged to give a job to his "schoolmates," young fellows who went to his school long after he had graduated.

In virtue of the "duties of universal obligation," the students owe their teachers the same consideration as their parents. Some years ago I found a job for one of my students who had to leave the seminary because his father died and his mother was alone at home. I did not think of him any more, as his job was not too bad. But last February I went to Chungking on business. I was walking up the hill towards St. Joseph's church when a ricksha coolie ran after me and said, "Just jump in. I know where you are going. I'll take you there." I jumped into the ricksha, the coolie ran as fast as he could. When he arrived at St. Joseph's I looked the ricksha coolie in the face and, to my great surprise, he was my student.

"In the name of Mary," said I, "what are you pulling ricksha for?" "Until recently," he explained, "I worked in that factory

you sent me to, and I earned enough money for mother and myself. But lately," he added rather gloomily, "my younger brother asked mother to send him to high school, so I made up my mind to pull ricksha so as to earn enough money for his schooling, too." I gave him all the dollar bills I had in my pocket, for he was a model of fortitude, benevolence, and filial piety.

If morally the Chinese are Confucianist, religiously they are Buddhist. Almost every household has a sanctuary dedicated to Kuan Yin, the so-called Goddess of Mercy; in the spring, tens of thousands of men and women go on pilgrimage to some sacred shrine, dozens of miles away; during the first half of the seventh moon, when the *wo-kui* or "hungry spirits" are let loose by Yen Lo Wang, the terrible Judge of the Underworld, each family burns incense and makes offerings, either in front of the house or in one of the temples; Buddhist monks and nuns are invited to perform ceremonies for the "redemption of souls": in almost every town there is a branch of the Fu Hsio Hui or Association for the Study of Buddhism, and in every village there is a Kuan Yin Hui, a kind of sodality composed of pious women and girls.

Buddhism was introduced from India into China in the first century A.D., and was officially recognized by Emperor Ming of the Han dynasty in the year 67. It spread rapidly. In the first half of the fourth century the capital, Loyang, alone counted no less than forty-two monasteries with adjoining temples and pagodas; the people of Chihli and Shansi, having received permission to take the vows and become monks and nuns, swarmed North and North-West China. A violent persecution started in 426 A.D. failed to stop this mushroom-like development and in 451 the emperor was forced by his own conscience to erect at Loyang a forty-foot statue of Buddha made of copper and thickly overlaid with gold, and to establish a monastery in each city throughout the empire. Twenty years later, in North China alone, 13,000 temples were opened to worshippers. From the north, Buddhism spread swiftly southward. In Nanking, Emperor Liang of Wu had all the Buddhist scriptures translated into Chinese.

In spite of sporadic persecutions, Buddhism enjoyed great prosperity during the Tang, Sung, Yuan, and Ming dynasties (620-1643). During the Tang and the Ming, especially, the bulk of the

common people devoted themselves with enthusiasm to the worship. The world-famous shrines of Puto, an island off the coast of Chekiang province, were established at the beginning of the Ming, under Emperor Wu Tsung.

The accession of the Manchus to the throne of China marked the doom of Buddhism as a state-recognized religion. In virtue of imperial edicts enacted during this dynasty (1644-1912), thousands of monks and nuns were secularized, and a great number of monasteries and temples were abandoned and fell to pieces. Buddhism has regained its freedom since the establishment of the Republic, in 1912.

The very word "Fu," the Chinese use for Buddha explains the fundamental principle of Buddhism. The character "Fu" in Chinese is composed of two words—"Jen," person, and "Fu," a negation. A "Fu" is, therefore, a being that transcends all mutations or changes, a being beyond the reach of the Law of Transmigration—a being in whom, the Buddhists say, "all desire is extinguished, and nothing moves, no more than the branchless trunk of a tree can move." Every living being must aspire to this "Buddahood" if he wants to avoid the indescribable torments of a perpetual reincarnation.

Two different schools show the way to this "final deliverance" —Hinayana or Little Way (Siao Ch'eng, in Chinese), and Mahayana or Big Way (Ta Ch'eng). Hinayana Buddhism is the primitive Buddhism supposedly taught by Buddha himself and introduced into China by the first two Indian missionaries, Kasyapa Matanga and Dharma Aranya. It is both pessimistic and egoistic in its fundamental teaching. According to this doctrine, soul does not exist. A succession of acts transforming one another makes the being in me, an individual being, moral and responsible, composed of five elements material and spiritual. Just how this series of fleeing acts can make a unity, and what are these elements component of my individual being, the Hinayana Buddhists fail to explain.

The moral precepts of Hinayana Buddhism are mostly negative and based on selfish motives—flight from pains and sufferings, and deliverance of oneself. Wilfully committing murder or theft or fornication is sinful; so is telling lies, or entertaining feelings of hatred or envy. Affection and desire are causes of suffering, and suffering and sins must be avoided or redeemed by

meritorious actions. But what is a meritorious action? Buddha says: "To give something to eat to an ordinary man is less meritorious than to give something to eat to a worthy man." For the value of a good action "is proportionate to the degree of perfection of the person to whom this good action is done."

To most Hinayanists nothing is real; everything is illusion, a shadow. I think I am, but I am not! No logical explanation has been given to reconcile this extreme idealism with the necessity of practising virtue. But since everything is illusion, is not virtue itself an illusion?

This philosophical incoherence is too subtle for the practical-minded Chinese. Mahayana, too, is subtle, and contains many paradoxes, but Mahayana is more successful in China insofar as it has given birth to another school, the Pure Land School, that gives vivid notions of goodness and pity, and presents a striking picture of paradise and hell.

The Mahayanists claim that all beings are the hypostases of a common spiritual principle, *dharmadhatu*, so that there is a soteriological solidarity among them. Man must work not only for his own salvation or "enlightenment," but also for the salvation of all beings, and he can do so by sharing his merits in their favor. Once "enlightened," he is entitled to beatitude. But in virtue of this soteriological solidarity, he will stay half way so as to help enlighten others—which he cannot do in a state of bliss, for then all desire is extinct.

What is this beatitude? According to primitive Buddhism it is Nirvana—the absorption of being in the fundamental principle. For the Pure Land School it is Sukhavati, the Pure Land of the West, or Western Paradise, a world of bliss separated from ours by thousands of other worlds all inferior to it. In this land where "the sun never sets and spring is eternal," there is no place for women, for there is only one sex, the male sex. It is governed by Amitaba Buddha.

In order to be admitted to the Western Paradise, one must practise charity or *mercy* not only toward human beings, but towards any living being—for animals and insects and reptiles are but reincarnations of human beings.

This explains the words "Fang Sheng Ts'e" engraved in bold characters on the embankment of many fish-ponds in China. Fang Sheng Ts'e literally means "Pond for the Release of Lives."

It is not uncommon to see people, young and old, throw live fish into these ponds, as an act of mercy. For the same reason monks and nuns and pious lay people abstain from meat and fish. In the monasteries even the eating of eggs is forbidden. Of course, the rule is not always rigorously observed. One day I was strolling in a temple when I saw a middle-aged monk seated at table behind a side altar. He was eating noisily a bowl of rice with vegetables and pieces of pork. "O-Mi-To-Fu, blessed be Buddha," said I, laughing out loud, "You are a modern monk!" He stopped eating and looked at me without being in the least vexed at my rude remark.

"Are you surprised," he asked, "that I should eat meat? To kill a living being, or do harm to it," he explained, "is a sin worthy of seven reincarnations. But meat is not a living being, it has no more life than that stone pavement you tread on."

I wonder if he hadn't learned casuistry. Anyhow, his reasoning was logical enough. Philosophically speaking, a dead pig is not a pig, but a corpse, a cadaver. A dead man, too, is a cadaver, not a man. And yet my parents spent more than two thousand dollars for my grandfather's burial—and it was not a first-class funeral.

The ceremonies for the dead are most elaborate. For my grandfather they were performed day and night without interruption for seven days. And it was necessary. Before the soul reaches its final destination it has to go through three "Boundaries" more or less material, thirty-three heavens and twenty-eight subsidiary heavens. Without the help of monks and nuns it is likely to go astray and be captured by some malignant spirit (Ya-Cha) and dragged into hell—and there are eighteen big hells, 500 small hells, and 1000 very small hells, which lost souls have to go through!

Go into a big Chinese temple and you will see a realistic representation of these hells. In the background, seated on an elevated throne, Yen Lo Wang, the Pluto of Chinese Buddhism, looks at you ferociously. Naturally you don't like to look back at him. But no sooner have you cast down your terrified eyes when a far more terrifying sight seizes your soul. Here, a devil is opening the stomach of a drunkard; there, another devil is pulling the tongue of a liar with red hot pincers; just behind him, a third devil is cutting a murderer piece by piece; a little farther, a man

who has forsaken his wife and children is nailed to a pole, his heart pierced with an iron sword; at the foot of the pole, a rich man who has been unjust to the poor is thrown into a cauldron of boiling oil. . . .

These tortures last thousands of years, and when they are over the sinners are sent back to the world. They are "reborn"—the drunkards become stray dogs; the heartless husbands become monkeys and climb up and down trees; the rich misers become worms and have to eat leaves all their lives. (Until quite recent years, foreign travelers who wrote books on China used to reproduce these scenes of horror to show the cruelty of the "Chinaman.")

The temples are places of attraction, if not always places of worship. They are particularly crowded during the religious festivals, such as the Spring Festival, the Dragon Festival (fifth of the fifth moon), the Festival of the Spirits (first half of the seventh moon), and the Moon Festival (fifteenth of the eighth moon). Most people go to the temples as they go to tea-houses —to do business, to tell or hear stories, or just to kill time, for many people have much time to kill. But there are also pious men and women who burn incense and make offerings to Buddha and Kuan Yin, the Chinese Madonna.

Kuan Yin is the most popular of the Buddhist "saints." Her image is found everywhere, and everywhere she is venerated. "No matter by what kind of misfortune a man may be stricken," say the Buddhists, "if he will only invoke Kuan Yin, he can be sure that Kuan Yin will deliver him and lead him to the Western Paradise." But she is especially popular among childless young married women, for she is supposed to be the giver of children. In each and every town or village there is a Kuan Yin Hui, a "Madonna Society" composed of pious women whose duty it is to promote her worship. Periodically members of this society gather together in a temple for a day of recollection or retreat. They practise abstinence and tell their beads daily.

The Buddhist "rosary" is unlike ours, being composed of variable numbers of beads—27, 54, 180, 1080. The way of saying it also varies according to the degree of initiation. Most people just repeat "Nan-Mo O-Mi-To-Fu" ("I turn to Amitaba in reverence and trust"), over and over again, pressing each bead tightly under both thumbs and both index fingers; but the better

initiated invokes a "saint" at each bead, and strongly concentrates his mind at each invocation.

It sometimes happens that members of such "sisterhoods" abstain from marriage. While they remain with their families, they renounce everything that is worldly, including their family names, and live like nuns.

Once my confrere Fr. Vincent Martin and I took a long walk in a hilly region where houses were scarce and the roads rough and narrow. We went into a private temple. An elderly man politely asked our "honorable names" and introduced us into a clean and well-furnished living room. Two young ladies in black brought us hot towels, while another young lady, also in black, put two cups of tea before us. All this was done in silence. I looked at Fr. Martin questioningly. His eyes questioned me back. We were both perplexed.

As soon as we had finished rubbing our faces with the hot towels, the three young ladies went out as silently as they had come in. A few seconds later a little bell started to tinkle, scanning with its metallic sound feminine voices repeating rapidly but in unison the popular invocation to Buddha Amitaba. The elderly gentleman took a seat in front of us, and I made up my mind to ask his "honorable name," although it was impolite to do so—a visitor being supposed to know the name of the person he visits. "We have no family," he answered, surprised at my ignorance, "your wretched servant and his three worthless daughters have left the world of dust."

What is the position of T'ien, the personal Ruler of Heaven On High, in this religion where there is no God? My father,who, for the past forty years, has been living outside the "world of dust" like Gautama Buddha himself, explained it to me one day, and his explanation reflects the common belief of all Chinese Buddhists. He said:

"T'ien governs everything and everything depends upon him. Without T'ien nothing can exist, not even Buddha Sakyamuni, nor Buddha Meitreya, nor Buddha Amitaba, nor Kuan Yin. By following faithfully the teaching of these Buddhas we can become one of them, but never can we become equal to T'ien . . ."

My father spends the day in the reading of Buddhist scriptures and in gardening, and the night in prayer and meditation. He eats neither meat nor fish nor eggs. When a fly or a mosquito

bothers him, he brushes it away. He never kills any living being. He is a Buddhist in the most rigorous sense of the term.

Yet, twice a month, on the fifteenth and thirtieth of each moon, he burns incense in honor of Heaven. When I was with him at home, he often said to me, "Be good to others and Heaven will be good to you." The day of my departure for Europe, he said, "May Heaven protect you and give you success in your study abroad."

Buddhist monks and scholars such as T'ai Hsu, Yuan Yin, Yin Kuang, and others have been working for the revival of Buddhism among the intelligentsia. In November, 1939, a Chinese goodwill mission, under the leadership of T'ai Hsu, visited India, Ceylon, Burma, and Malaya. Today almost every city has its Buddhist Academy. The one in Chengtu, three hundred miles west of Chungking, is particularly active. Known as Wen Shu Yuan or Manjusri Academy, it organizes public lectures and publishes books, newspapers, and magazines. The Tse Pei Ssu or Monastery of Mercy, near Chengtu, trains hundreds of young novices in Buddhist literature and liturgy.

All this movement aims primarily at winning over the educated but its success may have a powerful influence on the masses, who are still faithful to the religion of Buddha.

In order to counteract this movement and draw the learned class to Christianity, the Bishop of Chengtu, the Most Rev. J. Rouchhouse, has approached the author, a convert from Buddhism, and his confreres with a request to establish a center of higher learning in his diocese, called the Chinese and Western Institute of Cultural Studies. And at the suggestion of a Buddhist friend and scholar, keenly interested in Western civilization, the Bishop has sent the author to the United States to secure some assistance in favor of the new foundation—the first of its kind in West China. The task we have accepted is a difficult one, but given proper support we are determined to carry it through. The day will come, we are convinced, when Buddhist monks and scholars will say, as did the author twenty years ago, "We have been blindly following the Big Way and the Little Way while there is no real way other than Jesus Christ, who said, 'I am the Way.'"

THADDEUS YANG, O.S.B.
(Sub-Prior, Chengtu, China.)

St. John's Abbey,
Collegeville, Minn.

A LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN THE MIDDLE AGES

The Lay Folks' Mass Book is an artless and interesting title. It suggests a brand new publisher's item calculated to disarm the prospective buyer by a neighborly approach. You can envision the rough buckram binding and imagine the sociable air of the devotions it must contain. But the title is really only the name conferred by an editor on a medieval work written by one Dan Jeremy about the year 1150.

We know little about Dan Jeremy, although that little is more than enough to make it absolutely certain that he is not the fifth-century St. Jerome whom some copyists of his work guilelessly make him out to be.

A devoute man and religyous,

as one copyist more plausibly describes him, he was a priest most likely, or perhaps even a bishop, interested in getting the laity of his time to take an active part in the Mass.

His work, a prayer book for the use of one assisting at Mass, very likely written originally in French for the Norman nobility or gentry, was rendered into English verse in the later Middle Ages—how accurately we do not know for want of the original. In 1879 four copies of the English recensions, manuscripts dating from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, were edited for the Early English Text Society by Thomas Frederick Simmons, who called the English versions of Dan Jeremy's work and the volume in which he printed them *The Lay Folks' Mass Book.*

This volume deserves re-examination today, when the laity's part in the Mass is receiving more and more emphasis. The signs of lay activity which our editor Simmons found in the *Mass Book* were to him only the last pitiful relics of practices which Rome had conspired to throttle. Re-examination can exhibit them as something quite different, as witnesses to the vitality of the ideal of lay participation in the Church's liturgy.

The manuscripts of the English versions of Dan Jeremy's work which appear in *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* were all most likely written between 1380 and 1450. Except for the fact that they are in verse, these versions are not unlike the devotions for Mass common in prayerbooks of some decades ago, providing a set of

prayers which parallel those of the priest, interspersed with explanations and directions for those assisting at Mass.

Dom Fernand Cabrol, in his *Liturgical Prayer*, has pointed out the loss in the influence and character of the liturgy when different attitudes of mind are not reflected in different postures—as when, instead of now standing and now kneeling, the people remain riveted in one unalterable position. In Dan Jeremy's day, this liturgical ossification had not reached its most advanced stages. The various postures for the laity prescribed by the oldest and most interesting manuscript in the *Mass Book*—the manuscript to which we can principally confine our attention—show a response to the action of the Mass rather more sensitive than our present-day practice.

The directions in the *Mass Book* are described in the manuscript text itself as being at least in general for a said or a sung Mass. The laity knelt at the *Confiteor* and the *Misereatur*. This was, to speak strictly, the preparation for Mass, since the Mass proper was not ordinarily regarded, even by the early fifteenth century, as beginning with the prayers corresponding to the present prayers at the foot of the altar: only after these prayers, the scribe writes,

> als I guesse,
> Tho prest bigynnes office of messe.

And here, when the Mass begins, the people stand, remaining in this position until the *Gloria* is finished, when they kneel. They stand again for the Gospel and remain standing through the Creed and Offertory until the Secret, when they kneel—a nicety which present practice has dispensed with. At the Secret, too, they are encouraged to hold up their hands in prayer: it will help thy prayer, the text reads,

> If thou wil holde up bothe thi hende
> to god with gode devocioun,
> when thou sayes this oresoun.

At the *Per omnia saecula saeculorum* which introduces the Preface, the people stand, kneeling again as soon as the *Sanctus* has been said and remaining on their knees during the canon until the *Pater Noster*. At the Elevation, meanwhile, the author encourages his reader again to do as he did at the Secret:

> holde up both thi handes.

(Two of the other three texts tell the reader to incline his body at the Elevation.)

The laity stand at the *Pater Noster* and through the *Agnus Dei*, kneeling once more at the *Pax* and until the "rinsynge" (ablutions), after which they stand once more. When the priest is ready to read the Communion verse, the laity kneel, remaining in this posture until Mass is finished.

In this enterprising program the sense of active lay participation in the Mass is plainly trying to assert itself despite the handicaps of language and the loss of contact with the social roots of the incidental ceremonials of the Mass. Moreover, there is a determined effort directly to ride down these handicaps, as here, centuries after the people have been able to understand it, the writer stresses in many places the Mass's liturgical repartée. The people are the ones, it is pointed out, before whom the priest's confession of his sinfulness in made, and the *priest's* absolution after the Confiteor is to effect the remission of *their* sins:

> tho preste assoyles hom there belyve
> lered & lewed that wil hom shryve,
> & knowe to god that thei are ille.

The laity are not mere spectators here, for only those who confess their sins (those "that wil hom shryve") and who now acknowledge their guilt ("knowe to god that thei are ille"), are the objects of the priest's absolution. That the laity are more than onlookers here is further emphasized when, after this absolution, the *Mass Book* advises each one to say a *Pater*, an *Ave*, and either a *Credo* or a *Confiteor* as a penance. In this the people are as busy here as they would be in sacramental confession.

Moreover, the congregation is urged to answer the priest at the *Orate Fratres* aloud—"in high," the translator writes in what sounds like a gallicism—and to respond with the *Sed libera nos a malo* at the end of the *Pater Noster*:

> bot answere at temptacionem
> set libera nos a malo, amen,

the reader is instructed. The presence in the response of the *Amen*, said by the celebrant today, may testify either to an actual practice or to the author's own unfortunate weakness when confronted with temptation—in this case that of a convenient, if questionable, rhyme. It is not clear from the text whether or not

the people still said the *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus* with the priest, and the practice at the people's *Confiteor* and *Miseratur* near the start of the Mass seems to have varied, depending on whether the individual knew these two prayers in Latin or not. Thus the people's acknowledgement of their guilt is referred to as being made either privately or publicly: they should acknowledge their sinfulness

whether hit be in loude or stille.

Instructions are inserted throughout the *Mass Book* for the people to respond in mind and heart to the spirit of the liturgy at the various stages of the sacrifice. In this regard, the Preface has always been a key point in the Mass, and the *Mass Book* states that this is a time when the people should, in accordance with the priest's *Sursum corda*, not only "stand up" their bodies, but their hearts as well:

stande up thou, als men the biddis,
hert & body.

At the Memento for the Living, the reader inserts prayers for those dearest to him. The *Agnus Dei*, he is advised, ends with the Latin word for peace, and he is directed now, while the kiss of peace is being given, to pray for the gift of peace and charity.

From the nature of these directions, it is plain that *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* had to do with a time when the ideal of active lay participation in the Mass was faced with much the same difficulties as it is today. It would be satisfying to know how far and how late this way of meeting the problems of lay participation in the Mass prevailed in England. Unfortunately, it is difficult to say how much of our oldest manuscript of the *Mass Book* represents simply Dan Jeremy's original and how much it represents the practice current in the fourteenth century when the manuscript was written. According to Simmons, the 1380 scribe seems to have kept pretty close to the Rouen rubrics on which Dan Jeremy's original was based, without much attention to his own local church's practice. However, one can suspect that in its directions for the laity the product of the English scribe was considered in 1380 not entirely as a museum piece. It could well have appealed also as a manual offering suggestions feasible for current use.

For one thing, copying from a Northern version, the scribe puts

the *Mass Book* into his own Midland dialect, and, moreover, he copies without comment the line informing the reader that this is the way one should hear Mass. In this book, the scribe writes, Dan Jeremy

telles tho manere
how thou shulde thi messe here.

Nor is the verse form a sign that the book was unfit for practical use in this period. Rather the contrary. Verse, as a kind of sugar coating for the bitter bolus of learning, was a common thing in the fourteenth century in all sorts of instructional manuals. Thus Geoffrey of Vinsauf, for instance, the grammarian invoked by Chaucer in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, was famous for a versified textbook known throughout Western Europe. The very appearance of our *Mass Book* in verse kept it within the tradition of manuals intended for *use* as this tradition existed when the 1380 manuscript was copied out. Moreover, the text of this oldest of the four manuscript copies is followed quite exactly again by the latest of the four, written about 1450. Hence it seems that interest, at least, in the practices of Dan Jeremy's day, if not some local adherences to these practices, lingered into the mid-fifteenth century, when the latest manuscript was written.

But by this time, lay participation in at least some parts of England was slipping into the condition most persons today have been familiar with from their childhood. The two other manuscripts of the *Mass Book*, dating close to 1450, make less of the people's part in the prayers at the foot of the altar. At the *Orate Fratres*, the faithful are not told to reply aloud, but simply informed that the priest asks their prayers, and at the *Pater Noster* they answer "lowde *or* stille," the custom of answering here having reached an uncertain stage. There is evidence, too, that, no longer responding with their posture to the spirit of the different parts of the liturgy, the congregation knelt from the beginning to the end of the Mass.

This general picture of a slackening participation is confirmed by the *Merita Missae* of John Lydgate, the famous monk of Bury (c. 1370-c. 1450), which is printed in an appendix to *The Lay Folks' Mass Book*. But even here, amid evidence of a falling off in actual practice, the old ideal of more active lay participation lingers. In this brief treatise retailing to the laity the value of the Mass, Lydgate still takes time out to remind the people that the

introductory prayers at Mass are reciprocal prayers of priest and people:

> Pray thou than with good wille,
> Thou for him and he for the.

He also urges the people to pray at the *Orate Fratres* when the priest bids them to do so.

There are two ways to regard this picture of the laity's participation in the late medieval liturgy: one asserts that the ideal of active lay participation in the liturgy was condemned to death from the start; the other, that it showed remarkable persistency and hence was destined to live. The painstaking editor of our *Mass Book* leans to the former view.

His attitude is evident, for instance, in a long note in which he bridles at the feeling of dread and reverential awe associated with the saying of the Canon in silence. The occasion for the note is a passage in *A Treatise of the Manner and Mede of the Mass*, a late thirteenth-century work printed out of a late fourteenth-century manuscript in an appendix to *The Lay Folks' Mass Book*. The anonymous author of the *Treatise* protests that his readers have never heard anything better than what he tells them of, namely the Mass, save the very words of consecration themselves, which he refrains, out of reverence, from setting down:

> But better thing . then I have told,
> Herde ye never . of yong ne old
> On ground . that men may fynde,
> Save fyve wordes, . with-outen drede,
> That no mon . but a prest shulde rede
> Is comen . of cristen kynde.

The words of consecration for the wine, although not directly referred to in this place, are omitted also, and the author says he omits even a third item—what, no one seems to know.

To Simmons, this is pretty bad. Reverential secrecy concerning the Canon or anything else is the first move in a dark sacerdotal conspiracy which whispers its way out of Rome through all the corridors of history. Simmons goes on to cite various decrees forbidding vernacular translations of the Mass and particularly of the Canon, to back his suspicion that the baleful eye of Rome was hypnotizing the laity into a liturgical unconsciousness. Decline in lay activity for him springs largely from repression of

honest liturgical instincts rather than from a network of exceedingly complex circumstances. He fails to consider, for instance, the torque which heretical movements had given to the entire vernacular question and the consequent nervousness of the Church over the matter in a world budding heresy from the most unlikely places. Simmons is particularly misleading in connection with the 1661 bull of Alexander VII condemning a French translation of the missal. Leaping over several centuries to light upon this, the first papal document he can find relevant to his thesis, he does not notice that he has landed in the very vortex of the Jansenist diputes, and thus he badly misinterprets the moves of the Holy See—actions which more than any others demand of an interpreter the understanding of an involved historical context.

As a matter of fact, it would have been the easiest thing in the world to suppress active lay participation in the liturgy. To maintain the ideal of lay participation requires effort, and had not both clergy and laity always felt the ideal as a part of the Church's life, lay activity would have simply suppressed itself, and that long before Dan Jeremy's time.

The Middle Ages were not an entirely propitious time for developing every aspect of Catholic life. They were not propitious for the social aspects of the liturgy. As the liturgy had made its way from the Mediterranean into the hinterland of Europe which was to form the center of the medieval world, it had found conditions quite different from those under which it had first taken shape and conditions often much less adaptable to Christian ideals. In early Rome the Mass had been viewed as a sacrificial meal partaken of by the Christian community. Even here St. Paul had had to protest against abuses. But on the barbarian frontier, meals were not likely to come off at all so solemnly as one could reasonably expect in staid old Rome. It is to be suspected that frontier customs in general would not lend themselves so readily to the dignity and reverence necessary for the liturgy as had the mores of a highly civilized Greco-Roman world. Whatever its adaptability, the Church finds civilized customs more assimilable than others. It was difficult to find customs on the frontier suitable for attaching to the liturgy, and the contrast between the barbarian and the Roman ways in this regard, a contrast brought out so well by Edmund Bishop in his

now famous study, "The Genius of the Roman Rite," would be the more noticeable to anyone familiar with both cultures. Early missionaries from the Roman world necessarily were familiar with both. And they were not the only ones to return a verdict in favor of the Roman. As late as the ninth century the barbarian contributions to the liturgy were still felt to be so unsuccessful that Charlemagne set on foot his momentous reform to introduce the Roman rite everywhere in his realm.

Hence the demand for reverence and dignity did much to crowd local folkways and the folk themselves out of the liturgy. Certain special conditions favored the process. When Catholicism first felt its way out into the fringes of the Roman Empire, it found itself often preceded by Arianism. Forced to fight its way into a rough-and-ready frontier civilization against this boisterous heresy which denied the divinity of Christ, Catholicism was impelled to emphasize the awesomeness of Christ's person. Thus there was further reason to de-emphasize the meal aspect, for instance, of the Mass in throwing up against the Arian aberrations a screen of mystery quite unknown in the early Church.

The emphasis on the mysterious and awesome which had thus marked the entrance of the liturgy into what was to be the medieval world grew apace during the Middle Ages themselves. It was most likely always quite useful in combating persistent tendencies of the never entirely regenerate medieval mind. When we find the typical medieval monk, John Lydgate of Bury, an apparently devout enough man, composing in the fifteenth century a "Venus Mass" in honor of the pagan goddess of love, complete with *Introibo*, *Confiteor*, *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, Collects, Epistle, and so on, each part a specially composed dignified burlesque of the corresponding part of the real Mass, we realize that after more than a millenium the medieval mind, like the modern, could still learn something more of reverence.

But, however useful in combating irreverence, the stress on the mysterious and awesome aspect of the Sacrifice of the Mass was not beyond abuse. It encouraged the laity to keep at a respectful distance not only from the liturgy but from Holy Communion as well. And here is a far more central difficulty than any Simmons discusses. By the late Middle Ages Communion at Mass—the strongest link of the laity with the sacrifice, their very incorporation into it—was quite uncommon. Indeed, the question of Com-

munion finally showed itself for the major issue it was, when many early Protestants refused outright to communicate during Mass, even when they were willing to do so at other times. The Berengarian heresy, too, had taken its toll: the controversies it stirred up, periodically recurrent right down to Wyclif's time, had distracted men's minds from the sacrificial character of the Mass as they diverted attention with such violence to the less plainly social question of Transubstantiation.

Moreover, in a linguistically chaotic Europe, disciplined not even by printing presses and dictionaries, the Church had found it necessary to retain Latin as the only serviceable vehicle for bearing with a minimum of disaster the precious deposit of faith and the formulae for it worked out in the sweat and blood of the centuries. The liturgy of the Mass was itself a depository of doctrine. So it was kept in Latin, too. The very fact that by the late Middle Ages so little was known about the meaning of the incidental elements of the ceremonial made one reluctant to allow any change at all, especially in time of heretical squalls—one never knew what might be unwittingly jettisoned in the excitement of a storm. The bidding prayers for the various members of the universal and local churches were in the vernacular: but, with the sermon, these were considered as inserted into the Mass rather than as a part of it.

Moreover, if anyone had been convinced that active lay participation should have been suppressed, medieval devotional literature was at hand to ease the effect of the suppression. Particularly in England, for instance, there was the great body of devotional literature in the vernacular—large enough and strong enough, as the late Professor Raymond W. Chambers liked to show, to have kept single-handed the tradition of English prose alive for centuries after the Conquest. In this body of devotional literature could be found works, devout and inspiring, which helped the literate layman through the Mass—works, for instance, such as the *Meditations in Time of Mass* by the priest Langforde, which at the end of the medieval period sums up a long tradition. With hardly a word to indicate that the laity were more than spectators at the Sacrifice, this little tract makes the liturgy available to the devotion of the faithful quite independently of any social references, by means of an elaborate symbolism which compensates in resourcefulness for what it wants in

historical information. Thus, for example, the *Ite Missa Est* is referred to the dismissal of the Apostles and their return to Jerusalem after the Ascension, and the priest's about-faces for the *Dominus Vobiscums* are explained, with what may have offered some temptation to a theatrically accomplished celebrant, as signifying the apparitions of Our Lord after the Resurrection.

The intricacies of this "explanation" of the liturgy can easily vex the twentieth-century mind, unskilled in managing symbolism and distracted by the pseudo-historical vagaries. But Langforde's symbolism is sound, and it has genuine value. Many could agree with a certain reader of one manuscript of Langforde's book who, seeing the advice at the "Collecttes and Sequence" to "Have remembrance of the contynewall prayers. Ympnes. Salmes. and other orysons. whyche owr Savyour dyd offer for us to hys Eternall father," found himself noting in the margin, "This is indeed a good meditation and worthwhile for a Christian man." Could not the tradition of lay participation have easily liquidated itself in such private meditations as this book suggests?

It was not liquidated even by the time of *The Lay Folks' Mass Book*. There is every reason to think it would have been. The ideal of active lay participation in the liturgy had existed for centuries under almost impossible handicaps: a ceremonial built largely on unfamiliar customs, the demand for mysterious awesomeness, the neglect of Holy Communion, a non-vernacular language, and, to finish off everything, a great reservoir of sound private devotions in which the devout could submerge themselves during Mass—all this centered about an act of consecration which in any event depended essentially not on the presence of the body of faithful at all but only on the words and intention of those among them ordained priests.

The fact that the ideal of active lay participation is dying out in *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* is regarded by the book's editor as a sign that it was condemned to die. Those who today must approach the problem of lay participation with a greater realization of its practical difficulties will better discern the truth. After so many centuries when it plainly could be sustained only with great effort, the fact that the ideal was *still* dying out should rather be a pretty good sign that it would live.

St. Mary's College,
St. Mary's, Kansas.

WALTER J. ONG, S.J.

BROWNSON AND THE PAPACY

When the Vatican Council, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, finally defined the supremacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, there was one humble American lay publicist who hailed those solemn decrees with special joy and gratitude. That publicist was Orestes Brownson. Those solemn definitions were a source of much joy to him because he saw in their practical bearing on society the panacea that could heal the manifold wounds that afflict modern society. Years before he had fought one of the hardest battles of his long and stormy career for the practical recognition and acceptance of the papal prerogatives, and eventually withdrew from the fight, yielding to the suasion of friends, only after the controversy had threatened to disturb the peace of the Church in America. But he never abandoned his convictions in the matter. The publication of the Vatican decrees he hailed as a vindication of the battle he had fought, and as a death-knell, at least as to doctrine, of the Gallicanism and political atheism, against which as a Catholic journalist he was to renew and continue the fight.

It has been said that Brownson's philosophy of history has never been surpassed. In his philosophy of modern history he brings a heavy indictment against Gallicanism, which he held answerable, in a large degree, for the spread and growth of political atheism in the modern world, especially among the old Catholic nations. For, as Brownson understood it, the essential principle of Gallicanism, as given formal and final expression in 1682 by the French clergy under the headship of Bossuet, was not its denial of the Pope's infallibility, but rather its denial of his spiritual independence and of his supremacy in the government of the Church. Gallicanism subordinated the Pope both to the episcopacy and to the temporal order. It asserted the independence of secular governments in the face of the Church, and denied that the Soverign Pontiff, the divinely appointed guardian and expounder of the law of God, had any power to declare that law judicially as it applies to secular courts and governments. This was in principle to emancipate the state from the dominion of the law of God, leave the secular prince to rule as he saw fit, as a law unto himself. Thus it securely en-

throned political atheism as the religion of the modern state, encouraging universal and unmitigated political despotism. The denial of the infallibility of the Pope was a kind of smoke screen, according to Brownson. Admitting papal infallibility, the Gallican principle could not be defended, since Popes had repeatedly condemned it.

The best way to refute political atheism, which Brownson called the plague-spot of modern society and the gangrene of modern politics, was to attack Gallicanism, the source from which its doctrine stemmed. The attack demanded the positive assertion of the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope. But in bringing out these saving truths, not yet explicitly and formally defined, Brownson encountered some embarrassment. In 1851 a Jesuit Father, the president of a college in Dublin, besought him to reply to a specious article in the *Edinburgh Review*, entitled "Ultramontane Doubts." The reply would have been easy and simple if Gallicanism could have been rejected and the answer grounded on truly Catholic principles, but this could not be done. Gallicanism was still at that time an opinion tolerated in the Church—a *sententia in Ecclesia* though not a *sententia Ecclesiae*. "I regret," said the Bishop whom he consulted at the time, "that we cannot treat Gallicanism as a heresy, but we are not free to do that; you must make the best reply you can without condemning the Gallican doctrine." The reply Brownson made was masterly, but not satisfactory to himself. A few years later, in 1853, he endeavored to complete his teaching by elaborating and demonstrating more clearly the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, or representative on earth of the spiritual order which, *by its own nature*, is supreme over the temporal. Thus he aimed a death-blow at Gallicanism and political atheism.

The immediate occasion which let him to take up this discussion was the publication by the excellent and learned M. Gosselin, Director of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris, of a number of volumes on the power of the Popes during the Middle Ages. In these volumes the author expounds the theory, adopted from Fenelon, that the power exercised over temporal princes by the Supreme Pontiffs in the Middle Ages was not inherent in the Papacy by divine constitution, nor was it held from the inherent universal supremacy of the spiritual order, but was rather a power

conferred on the Popes by the concession of sovereigns, the consent of the people—what was called at the time the public law, the *jus publicum* of Christendom. In advancing the theory, M. Gosselin had the laudable motive of exculpating from the charge of usurpation the Soverign Pontiffs who had exercised the said power during the Middle Ages. The theory, however, unfortunately gave a human origin to this power exercised by the Popes, and asserted they held and exercised it *jure humano*, not *jure divino*. As convenient and popular as this explanation was, Brownson could not accept it. He did not indeed deny that the Popes held the power they claimed in the way and by the tenor alleged. But he objected to the Gosselin theory, in brief, not in what it asserted, but in what it denied. He could not but regard it as a prop to Gallicanism that would further the spread and growth of political atheism. The best interests of religion and society urged him to put forth his most gallant efforts to discredit both Gallicanism and Gosselinism, and to exalt the papal prerogatives to the very highest point of orthodoxy as the only means of curing the manifold ills of a secularized society.

But the shafts that Brownson so vigorously levelled at Gallicanism stirred up at once a storm of controversy. Particular exception was taken to his assertion that the Popes in the Middle Ages used the power of the keys in deposing Catholic sovereigns who had violated their oaths of fidelity. Bishops and priests told him that he was not defending Catholic doctrine but "ultramontane views" of Catholic doctrine, that he was only reviving an old, exploded theory, generally abandoned by all Catholic theologians, and perhaps by Rome itself, or if defended at all, only by an individual here and there of questionable orthodoxy or soundness of judgment. The controversy raised, they charged, was likely to expose the Church in this country to unnecessary odium. The sooner a quietus was put on the affair, the better for the interests of all.

To this Brownson replied that he had not discussed the deposing power exercised by the Popes in the Middle Ages as an isolated, but only as an incidental, question. The real question he had set out to discuss concerned the mutual relations between the two orders, the spiritual and the temporal. This question he could not ignore, for every controversy between Church and State, every controversy between the Church and any of the

sects or any individual, is at bottom a controversy between the two orders, the spiritual and the temporal, and resolves itself into the question: which of the two orders is supreme? On the solution of this question turn the great controversies of every age. How, he asked, can one refute political atheism and defend the rightful dominion of God over the political order if one can not assert and maintain the supremacy of the spiritual order, and therefore of the Pope, its representative and guardian in the government of men and nations? There is no way possible, he affirmed, of putting down the great heresy of the age, political atheism, other than by drawing on the most vigorous ultramontanism.

The assertion that the Popes in the Middle Ages deposed Catholic sovereigns by the power of the keys, or by divine right, he made, he said, because he found in the history of the Church that the great mediaeval Popes, St. Gregory VII, Innocent III, Boniface VIII, and others, claimed that they held and exercised that power by divine right, as representatives of the spiritual order. In every instance the Sovereign Pontiffs professed to hold and exercise that power by virtue of their apostolic authority, as Vicars of Christ on earth. And that the Popes do so hold this power was actually defined to be of faith by Boniface VIII in the bull *Unam Sanctam*, which has never been and never can be abrogated. (Clement V, when Philip the Fair demanded its recall, answered that he could not recall it, because it contained a dogmatic definition.) No Catholic, therefore, is at liberty to suppose that the Sovereign Pontiffs were ignorant of the title by which they claimed to hold and exercise that power or that they misstated it, for the office, powers, and prerogatives of the Papacy are as much a matter of definable faith as the mystery of the Blessed Trinity or the Incarnation.

It is by having drawn this great truth out of the history of the Church that Fr. Joseph P. Donovan, J.C.D., Kenrick Seminary, thinks that Brownson established one of his claims to greatness. Speaking of this fact he says: "Cardinal Gasquet referred to Lord Acton as the most erudite man of his age; but this historian could not discover the obvious in the history of the Church. Nor could the great Newman. Brownson was the opportunist because his Catholic instincts were deep and sure. The gifts of the Holy Ghost working within his mind made him more than the greatest

of mere human historians, when it came to reading aright the foot prints of the Milk White Hind adown the centuries."

It was also a satisfaction to Brownson to be able to point out in defence of his advocacy of the papal power that he stood not entirely alone in the Catholic world. The same vigorous papal doctrine he found set forth in the learned and highly esteemed *Théologie dogmatique* of the illustrious Cardinal Gousset of Rheims, as well as in *The Universal History of the Catholic Church*, by the learned Abbé Rohrbacker, a Doctor of Theology in the University of Louvain. The Abbé made the papal power the central theme of his Church history, and hence it appears prominently in nearly every one of the twenty-nine volumes of his work. In the midst of the storm of opposition which its publication stirred up, it was a consolation and an encouragement to the author to learn through Cardinal Mai, Prefect of the Congregation of the Index, that his history was looked upon at Rome with distinct favor. In this reassurance given Abbé Rohrbacker, Brownson saw an approbation of his own stand. And he took occasion to write his own encouragement to Abbé Rohrbacker: "Allow me to say," he wrote, "that what I especially admire in your work is its papistical tone, and its constant effort to make Catholics understand that Our Lord founded His Church on Peter, and has never admitted the state to Holy Orders. Your vindication of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and refutation of the Four Articles of the Assembly of 1682, are alone a most invaluable service to the Catholic public, although I fear we shall never find any considerable number of statesmen who will not be political atheists."

While Brownson's own eloquent appeals for a recognition of the papal power met mostly with indifference and opposition, nevertheless there were some who sent him their warm words of approbation and encouragement. The Rev. William Cumming, in a letter from Rothsay, Isle of Bute, dated Oct. 6, 1857, wrote:

> I have been on the point of writing you many a time these three or four years past, were it only to thank you for having completely changed in the right direction my own and many of my companions' views on certain facts in history—for having shown us the ***necessity*** and I will add the ***happiness*** of holding fast to the thread that alone can guide us in the mazes of history, *Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia.* I was a

great Gallican once—God help me—but if I had been asked why, it would have been found that political prejudice and not *reason* was at the root of it all. Your works gave my mind another bent, which a good papist professor of theology and as good a professor of history served to strengthen and confirm. I will add, that the professor himself (in the Grand Séminaire of Cambrai) in the beginning looked at the facts of history through the untrue mirror of the respected M. Gosselin's theories; but after a hard fight in class for some weeks, sustained I admit mainly on your *arguments,* he was induced to study things more carefully, and the result was that he *revint sur lui-même,* studied the *original documents himself,* and finished by giving us a course which many will remember to the end of their lives, on this idea, that we must take the Church's *own interpretation* of her own acts. You have the glory before God of having sowed the good seed deep in the souls of a hundred or two of young priests, who will not have received it in vain.

But in spite of whatever words of encouragement came to Brownson, or whatever facts he might marshal in his own defense, he found the opposition to his championship of the papal power too strong. As he explained years later, yielding to the suasion of friends who besought him, lest the peace of the Church be disturbed, he withdrew from the fight. And thus it was only the Vatican Council, held years later, that finally came to his rescue in solemnly defining the supremacy and infallibility of the successor of Peter in the See of Rome. With what joy and gratitude the old battle-scarred veteran hailed these Vatican decrees can be guessed only by those who have read the story of the bitter gale he had weathered when years previously he had asserted and defended those high papal prerogatives. What he deemed of most importance as bearing on the controversies of the day, was the Council's utter condemnation of the first three Gallican articles, which controverted the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ, both in relation to the civil power and in relation to the general council, and the assertion of the primacy of jurisdiction of the successor of Peter in relation to both. The proclamation of this papal power levelled "a death-blow at the wretched Gallican dualism and political atheism which enfeebles and kills the life of every modern nation." He felt free now for the first time in his life, he said, to defend the Church unhampered by a mutilated orthodoxy. He could now bring out and insist on the very truth needed to combat the dominant heresies of the age.

And with renewed energy and assurance he returned once more to a promulgation of his ultramontanism as the only medicament that could heal the wounds of a well-nigh moribund society.

It was with rare satisfaction that he noted, too, that the Vatican Council was the first of the ecumenical councils, as far as he could discover, that had ever treated the primacy of Peter as the first part of *De Ecclesia*, or the foundation, before treating the body of the Church. All previous councils, and all theologians with whom he was acquainted, whether Thomists, Augustinians, Jesuits, Gallicans or Ultramontanes, those who recognized the primacy at all, had uniformly treated the body of the Church before treating its head. Even the theologians designated to prepare the *Schema de Ecclesia* for the consideration of the Council, undoubted defenders of the papal prerogatives as they were, did the same. This method struck him as very unscientific, for to him an acephalous church was a meaningless thing. His *Brownson's Quarterly Review* had steadily maintained that our Lord founded His Church on Peter, and that without Peter it has no foundation. A church without a foundation is founded on nothing and is nothing—a mere castle in the air; without Peter you have no Church at all.

Ever mindful that the Sovereign Pontiff as head of the Church is the Vicar of Christ on earth, Brownson deplored any lack of reverence and loyalty shown him on the part of our Catholics. He disliked most cordially the manner in which the authors of our more popular histories, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, especially in this country and England, uniformly deal with the historical quarrels between Peter and Caesar. He asserted that he had read Church history as Catholic and Protestant, and in no instance did he find Peter in the wrong and Caesar in the right. On the contrary, he affirmed, "all history proves that the Pope is ever too slow to arrest the tyranny, oppression, the wickedness of crowned monsters, such as Henry IV of Germany, the Hohenstaufen, Henry of Luxemburg, and Louis of Bavaria, to name no others. The papal forbearance to strike, and liberate the Church from oppression and society from wicked and lawless rulers, is one of the marvels of history." The implied abuse to which the Pope was sometimes subjected in the Catholic pulpit in his day, when the respective realms of Peter and Caesar were the theme, was a deep scandal to Brownson. Such uncalled-for vituperation

was unintelligible to him, and on occasions he would break out into strong appeals for love and gratitude to the sacred person of Christ's Vicar on earth:

> The saddest page of all modern history is that which records the ingratitude of individuals and nations to the holy pontiffs who, for these eighteen hundred years, have ruled the Church of God, and labored for the eternal salvation of mankind. They have borne the brunt of the battle; they have been the mark of every arrow; they have been the peculiar objects of the wrath of man and the assaults of hell; they have often been insulted by their own children; and scarcely one drop of consolation have they during these long ages been permitted to taste, except that consolation which is vouchsafed them by the interior visits of the Holy Spirit. O, how the world has wronged them, and how slow and how loath are we to make them some little reparation! O, let us away with our cold, half-heretical reserve, away with our ungenerous distrust, and let our hearts gush forth in warm and pure love to the viceregent of God on earth, and never for a moment suffer a mere secular prince to weigh in the balance with him.

As the strategy of the enemy is always to attack the center of unity and strength in any organization, Brownson was at no loss to understand the ceaseless hostility to, and the everlasting assaults on, the Papacy. And for this same reason Brownson would rally Catholics of all lands round their great spiritual chief, appealing to them to support him by their prayers, their filial love and obedience. Ross Hoffman in his book *Restoration* sounds forth his call to Catholics to rally to the side of the Pope, but those who really wish to thrill to that summons should read Brownson; for, echoing and re-echoing through his volumes are stirring appeals to rally to the Pope—appeals that should make the heart of a Catholic leap with joy. At times he seems almost beside himself when speaking of God's vicegerent on earth. And he appealed not only to Catholics as individuals but to nations also to revere and heed the successor of Peter in the See of Rome as the foundation and promise of national well-being and future greatness. "Every nation," he said, "that has refused filial love and reverence to the chair of Peter has been hurled from the seat of its greatness, as France, Spain, and Portugal can bear witness. The only true policy, the only true wisdom in our times, is in exalting the chair of Peter, and energetically asserting the ponti-

fical authority, and the universal supremacy of the spiritual order. The salvation of the world in more senses than one depends on the Holy See, and on a loyal submission and filial obedience in all things to the successor of St. Peter."

THOMAS RYAN, C.PP.S.

Precious Blood Mission House,
New Cumberland, Pa.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for Feb., 1896, the leading place is accorded to an article entitled "The Union of the Churches," by Fr. Brandi, S.J. It is a commentary on the letter which the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople had recently published as a reply to the apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII, inviting all the rulers and nations of the world to return to the unity of Catholic faith. . . . Fr. Gigot, S.S., contributes a scholarly article on "The Hebrew Bible." . . . There is an interesting account, by Fr. F. E. Smith, of the work done by a commission for the revision of the breviary in the time of Pope Benedict XIV. One of the proposed modifications would have transferred or omitted all feasts of nine lessons occurring in Lent, with the exception of St. Peter's Chair, St. Joseph and the Annunciation. . . . The *Analecta* section presents the decrees of the Inquisition, issued July 24, 1895, condemning direct abortion even in the event that otherwise both mother and child would die. (It should be remembered that shortly before this time some Catholic moralists had regarded the direct abortion of a non-viable fetus as sometimes justifiable on the ground that it was an unjust aggressor). . . . The question is discussed as to whether the sermon should precede or follow the Way of the Cross at Lenten devotions. In the reply the latter method is recommended.

F. J. C.

JOHN GILMARY SHEA ON ARCHBISHOP FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK

His visitations of his diocese were always productive of great good; being punctual and accurate, a close observer of the laws of the Church, he sought to have his clergy follow the same path. . . . His leisure hours were always given to study, so that his friends complained that he allowed few opportunities for them to enjoy his presence among them.

—Henry De Courcy and John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1879), p. 177.

GRIEVANCE
PART III

When the judges filed into the court-room for the next day's session the financial records of the Parish of St. Mary were on the Notary's table. As soon as the session was opened the *Vice-officialis* announced that he intended to choose Father Alvin Morford, C. P. A.,[1] who taught accounting at a nearby Catholic college, as expert to go over the financial records and report whether in his opinion they showed that the parish could or could not have paid more money to its janitor during the period from Aug. 1, 1940, to Aug. 1, 1945.[2] He was moved to make this appointment, he added, by the recommendations of the *Promotor Justitiae* and Father Arnold. Father Wall knew of Father Morford by reputation, and he indicated through Fathers Brockheim and Brown that he had no objection to the appointment.[3] The *Vice-officialis* thereupon instructed the bailiff to bring Father Morford into the court-room that he might be formally notified of the appointment, take the oath,[4] and receive the records to be examined.

The accountant's report would show the court what the financial records indicated as to the ability of the Parish to pay a higher salary to the janitor, but that would not entirely solve the problem of the "living wage." There was also a question as to the manner in which the money received was spent, whether proper care was taken of the family and a proper desire for saving was fostered,[5] and whether the education and temporal welfare of the children was cared for properly.[6]

Since Faber had indicated that his wife had charge of the spending of what he made, Mrs. Faber was now called to the stand to tell, since the family had kept no books which could be examined as could those of the parish, how, in general, she had spent the wages of her husband.

A competent, straightforward little woman, she told what she had had to pay for food and clothing for her husband, the children, and herself. She explained that, where she had been able to buy five pounds of potatoes for fifteen cents in 1940, it cost

[1] Cf. Can. 1793, §1; 1795, §1.
[2] Cf. Can. 1799, §1.
[3] Cf. Can. 1793, §2.
[4] Cf. Can. 1797, §1.
[5] Cf. Can. 1524.
[6] Cf. Can. 1113.

her twenty-nine cents to buy the same amount in 1945. Celery hearts, which she had been able to buy for twenty cents in 1940, cost her forty-five cents in 1945. Asparagus, which had been five cents a bunch in 1940, cost her twenty-five cents in 1945. Fruit-cocktail, which the children liked so much, she had had to give up when it had increased in price to forty cents, whereas it had been eighteen cents in 1940. As a result of this increase in prices she had had to discontinue buying these and several other items which she named.

Sirloin steak, even when she had the points, now cost fifty-five cents a pound, whereas it had cost her forty-five cents a pound in 1940. Lamb chops she had had to discontinue buying because they were now fifty cents a pound, where they had been twenty-nine cents. Thin navel corned beef, which she used to buy in 1940 for twelve cents a pound, was now up to forty-nine cents, so that did not appear on the table very often.

A dress, which she used to be able to get for the little girl for eight dollars would now cost thirty, she said, so she was having to make over a lot of things. Stockings, which she could buy in 1940 for fifty-nine cents, now, in 1945, cost a dollar and a quarter. She had been able in 1940 to buy her daughter a coat and hat for twenty-two dollars, whereas in 1945 the coat alone would cost fifty-five dollars, and the hat would cost another five dollars.

She had made over her own dresses as much as she could, and she did a lot of her own sewing and so was able to get along better than if she had had to buy everything. Mr. Faber got along pretty well with one good suit, because most of the time he could wear work-clothes, but the work-clothes were getting harder to get all the time.

Back in 1940 they had managed pretty well on the salary Mr. Faber got, and were even able to put something into those Postal Savings Bonds, which they called "War Bonds" now. After the experience she had had while Mr. Faber was in the sanatorium she had learned the value of "something for a rainy day," and she had insisted that they should save when they could see their way clear to put something by. That money, however, had been used up to pay the doctor when Mr. Faber had his fall, and since then they had not been able to save a thing.

The children went to the parish school. They were doing well there, and she and Mr. Faber managed to see to it that the

tuition, which was not very much, really, was paid regularly. After all, they did not like to have the report come out to the parish without their names on it with the tuition all paid up.

Mrs. Faber corroborated what her husband had said about how he had come to take the job as janitor in the parish. She also mentioned the difficulty they were having in paying back the money they had borrowed after his accident. They were not being pressed for payment, it was true, but still she did not like that cloud hanging over them.

She also said that the house was a nice, snug one, and adequate for the needs of the family. They were lucky to have such a nice house when it was so difficult for other families to find a place to live. Bills for electricity, coal, taxes, and repairs had been taken care of by the parish, all right. She did not know what they would have done, had they had to worry about paying those bills, too.

Another child would have been too much of an expense, she said. She and Mr. Faber were trying to do the right thing, but at times it was awfully hard, she said, breaking a bit, and people just would not believe that you were doing the right thing, they always looked at you kind of funny and with a sort of sneering look.

Recovering her composure after the last bit of testimony, she said she had enjoyed going to the cottage for the two weeks in the summer-time, and was very grateful to Father Wall for giving them the chance to go there. They certainly would never have been able to rent a cottage which would have been so nice and in such a nice location. That was one of the reasons why she had not liked the idea of this trouble getting started. Father Wall was really very nice. He was kept so busy with all the things he had to do in the parish that he could not think of everything, and then, too, he had to struggle, she imagined, to make ends meet on what the people of the parish contributed. Even if Mr. Faber won his suit she did not know whether he would be able to keep his job, and there was so little that he could do, with that bad lung, and with the back injury he had. She wished this sorry mess had not come up at all, but it had been so hard of late to make ends meet.

She had not been present when Mr. Faber fell down the steps while trying to move the case of candles. All she knew of the

injury was that he had been brought home later than she had expected that Saturday evening by one of the people from town and he had told her about the fall and about going to the doctor. He had complained quite often after that of a dull pain in his back which she had tried to ease by rubbing his back with alcohol but the relief had been only temporary. The doctor had said that he should have an operation, he thought; but of course, they could not afford that. The doctor had been most kind, and Father Wall had looked in a couple of times, but he could not be around there all the time. Sometimes the pain seemed to be quite sharp, and then Mr. Faber would even cry out, but that did not happen too often. He had mentioned that that was what had occurred when the things got broken in the church.

When the interrogation of the parties was thus concluded[7] and their admissions against interest[8] were on record, it was time to proceed to the interrogation of witnesses in the case. Mrs. Faber, of course, was not a witness,[9] for her testimony was to be included with that of her husband as a statement of a party.[10]

Father Arnold and Fathers Brockheim and Brown had drawn up lists of the names and addresses of witnesses for their respective sides of the case, and had presented them along with the original petition and counter-claim,[11] and the *Promotor Justitiae* had also presented a list of the witnesses whom he wanted heard.[12] The lists of names were so constructed that the Tribunal could easily see which questions on the lists submitted by the attorneys[13] could be answered by each witness. These lists were then exchanged so that each side could see what witnesses the other intended to call.[14]

Checking the list submitted by Father Arnold, Fathers Brockheim and Brown noted that he had included a witness who was known to hate the pastor very much, and to have expressed the feeling openly. Father Arnold found in the list submitted by Fathers Brockheim and Brown the name of a man who was none too highly regarded in the parish for his mental capacity. When, therefore, the lists were returned to the Tribunal within the

[7] Cf. *Code* lib. IV, tit. IX.
[8] Cf. *Code* lib. IV, tit. X, c. 1.
[9] Cf. Can. 1757, §3, 3°.
[10] Cf. Can. 1757, §3, 1°.
[11] Cf. Can. 1759, §1; 1761, §1.
[12] Cf. Can. 1759, §2.
[13] Cf. Can. 1761, §1.
[14] Cf. Can. 1763.

required three days,[15] the attorneys for each side presented motions to have the witnesses to whom they objected excluded from the lists.

The *Vice-officialis*, looking over the lists himself, granted the motion by Father Arnold,[16] as well as that by Fathers Brockheim and Brown.[17] He also made certain that there were not so many witnesses named that the case would be unnecessarily prolonged.[18] Having done this he had the Notary prepare the summons for each witness, which was signed, sealed, and served, as those for the parties had been.[19]

Because of the nature of the case, and in order that he might have the assistance of the parties in eliciting all the information which the witnesses could give without having to call them back to clear up doubts,[20] the *Vice-officialis* allowed the parties to be present not only at the swearing in of the witnesses[21] but also at their examination.[22]

One by one[23] the witnesses were called and sworn in.[24] The doctor who had treated Faber's injury was called first to describe its nature, and the treatment given, as well as what further treatment was, in his opinion, necessary. He told the Tribunal that the injury was fundamentally a dislocation of a vertebra, such as might result from a severe wrenching of the back. This sort of injury, he said, could occur in a fall. The X-ray picture also showed a calcium deposit in the shape of a small hook on the vertebra in question. Since he had not been able, in the treatments which he had given Faber, to put the vertebra back in place so that it would stay, it was quite conceivable that at times the vertebra might slip out of place again and in that case the small hook might catch the spinal cord producing a sharp pain and a sudden muscular reaction.

The doctor, when asked why he had suggested that Faber go to the hospital, replied that in the hospital Faber could be given a "laminectomy," an operation which would remove the cartilage

[15] Cf. Can. 1764, §4.
[16] Cf. Can. 1757, §1.
[17] Cf. Can. 1757, §2, 3°; 1764, §2; 1764, §5.
[18] Cf. Can. 1762.
[19] Cf. Can. 1765.
[20] Cf. Can. 1781; 1786; 1858; 1861, §1.
[21] Cf. Can. 1767, §2.
[22] Cf. Can. 1771.
[23] Cf. Can. 1772, §1.
[24] Cf. Can. 1767, §1; 1770, §1.

below the vertebra which was out of place, permitting it to become fused with the vertebra below, so that it would not slip out of place so easily in the future. At the same time, the doctor explained, the hook would be removed, and so would any other projections which might give trouble in the future. He told the court also what the cost of such an operation, including hospital and nursing charges, would be.

The court felt that this point was so important that it decided to have Faber examined by another doctor appointed, *ex-officio* by the court.[25] This second doctor was also to take X-rays and give his opinion as to the nature of the injury. He was also to explain what he would consider the proper treatment of the case.[26]

The court next heard the grocer from whom Mrs. Faber was in the habit of purchasing food. He told the court how the prices of various commodities had gone up in the past five years, referring as he did so to notations which he had brought with him.[27]

The butcher from whom Mrs. Faber had been buying meat next took the stand and corroborated her testimony as to the increase in the price of meats during the past five years. He, too, was permitted to refer from time to time to notes which he had brought with him.

The owner of the local dry-goods store also testified to the increases of prices on the articles which he had to sell, articles which Mrs. Faber had from time to time purchased in his store for her family and for herself.

The following day, Ralph Agostino, who with his brother worked for the Express company in Jordan, took the witness chair to testify that when cases of candles, which were of a fairly uniform size as he recalled, were to be delivered he and his brother always worked together, because the cases were so heavy that there was too much danger of one fellow straining himself if he attempted to move such a case alone.

Jack Agostino explained at some length that he would not think of trying to move a case of candles like those they had delivered to the church without some one along to help him,

[25] Cf. Can. 1792; 1795, §1; 1797.

[26] Cf. Can. 1799.

[27] Cf. Can. 1777; 1776, §2.

especially if he had to get the case down a flight of stairs. He had delivered candles to the church before and he knew what it was like to try to get the cases down into the basement with those steep stairs they used to have there. Now that they had a flight of stairs which was not so steep a fellow did not have it so hard, but it used to be dangerous to try to move heavy stuff up and down those stairs before they were fixed, and he, for one, would never try to move anything like a case of candles alone, especially when the stairs were so steep. Why, a man might get hurt bad, just like this here Faber did.

The janitor from the Cathedral, dressed in his work-clothes and looking around for a ventilator which was not working well, was brought in *ex officio* after the Agostinos had been heard. He was sworn in, somewhat surprised, and asked to sit down in the witness chair. The court simply wanted to know whether cases of candles were of a more or less standard size. When the janitor said they were, the court asked whether he was in the habit of moving them alone, or whether he got help. He insisted on having help to move the cases of candles, the janitor said, for they were much too heavy for a man to move them alone without straining himself. He would no more think of moving a case of candles alone than he would of flying.

After the noon recess the day's session was resumed and three women from the parish were called as witnesses, one after the other. Their testimony as to the increase in prices and the difficulty which they had found in making ends meet for their families paralleled that of Mrs. Faber. They also told of seeing the Faber children frequently on the street. The children, they agreed, were always neat and clean, but they were certainly not expensively dressed. Mrs. Faber they judged a clean and efficient housewife not given to fancy clothes or "airs." They had been in her home which was well kept, though it was certainly not too well furnished. They knew what the janitor received as salary, because it was published in the annual report among the parish expenses, and they thought she did very well to manage on what her husband made, considering the expense of raising children and all, and they paid up their tuition to the school, too. Mrs. Faber was always so cheerful even though she had had a hard time of it, what with her husband not being too strong, poor man, he had been in a sanatorium, as they probably knew,

and he did do such a nice job of taking care of things around the church, school, and rectory. Of course, he had help from the boys in the school and from the altar society in the church, but then he did have a lot to do himself, and every once in a while the pain in his back would catch him and he would have to sit down for a while, and that meant he had to hurry faster to get his work done later, and he really was not very strong, poor man.

Of course, the Fabers had the use of the house which belonged to the parish, so they did not have the expense of rent, and the bills for the electricity, coal, taxes, and repairs were paid by the parish, they knew, because they had seen those things in the parish report. Probably that was why he did not get any more salary than he did, seeing as how the parish was taking care of a good portion of the living expenses of himself and his family, and any one knew that nowadays those things certainly counted up, why a body scarcely knew where the money went these days.

The court adjourned after hearing the three women from the parish, but before doing so the *Vice-officialis* read to Faber and Father Wall and their attorneys a decree to the effect that on the following day the court would proceed to Jordan to visit the Parish of St. Mary at three o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of inspecting the stairs to the basement of the church to see for itself where the accident had occurred.[28]

Since there was no reason to expect any trouble, the parties were permitted to be present with their attorneys when the *Vice-officialis*, accompanied by the same two Synodal Judges and the Notary, arrived at the parish church on the afternoon of the next day.[29] A member of the parish, a contractor, was also on hand to testify as to his work in fixing the stairs after Faber had his fall.[30] He explained that he had put in a new stair because the old one had been too steep. The new one sloped more gradually into the basement of the church and had wider treads so that the footing was more secure. He had likewise provided for a light at the head of the stairs and another at the bottom, since before that there had been only two bulbs hanging in the basement, one in the half near the stair and the other in the half toward the front of the church.

As the contractor explained the former situation and what he

[28] Cf. Can. 1806; 1807. [29] Cf. Can. 1809. [30] Cf. Can. 1810.

had done to remedy it, the Notary took down what he said in longhand, and at the end read it back to him before the contractor, the *Vice-officialis*, and the Notary signed it. While the contractor was giving his explanation Father Arnold and Fathers Brockheim and Brown from time to time handed notes to the *Vice-officialis* suggesting more points which should be cleared up. The Notary, of course, indicated in his report the day and hour of the visit to the church, the names of those present, and all that was done and said in the course thereof.[31] Before the *Vice-officialis* and the Synodal Judges together with the Notary departed for the episcopal city the *Vice-officialis* and Notary signed the report to authenticate it.

The following day the doctor appointed by the court to examine Faber gave his report, which corresponded substantially with the testimony of the doctor who had first treated the janitor. He found from the X-rays that the vertebra was out of line and that there was a hook, apparently a calcium deposit, which could, by catching the spinal cord, have caused the sharp pains which Faber's case history showed to have occurred from time to time. He recommended, as the other doctor had, a "laminectomy," and proceeded to describe the operation for the benefit of the court, not realizing that the court was already informed as to the nature of such an operation.[32]

The doctor's testimony was taken down as were the testimonies of the other witnesses.[33] The court was not content to hear only his statement of his findings, but proceeded to question him as to the method he had used in discovering the nature of the injury, when, where, and how he had examined Faber, and what reasons precisely he had for saying that the injury was of the type described and that it would produce the results mentioned in the case history. He was also asked whether some other means of curing the defect might be found, means which would not involve an operation.[34] He was asked, further, how much it would ordinarily cost for such an operation and hospital and nursing care. His estimate was higher than that of the first doctor, so a third doctor was called in later, *ex-officio*, and asked how much he thought the costs would be.[35]

[31] Cf. Can. 1811; 1585, §1.
[32] Cf. Can. 1802.
[33] Cf. Can. 1801, §1.
[34] Cf. Can. 1801, §3.
[35] Cf. Can. 1803, §1.

Father Morford was heard next. He explained that he had used the reports published annually to the parish to make a "balance sheet audit." This he had checked for accuracy by making a "sample audit" here and there in the records for each of the five years. The results of his study showed that the net income of the parish had increased during the five year period, so that it would have been possible to pay a higher salary to the janitor and to the pastor, as well as to the nuns who taught in the school. None of the salaries paid by the parish, he found, had been increased during this period.

Asked what would be the value of the rent on the house had Faber been required to pay it, Father Morford took the reports and made a hasty computation on the basis of tax valuation. He also totaled the sums paid by the parish for coal, electricity, taxes, and repairs. The result showed that the parish had certainly paid out more than five hundred and fifty ($550) dollars for housing, light, and heat for the janitor in addition to the salary which it had paid him.

When Father Morford had finished testifying and had left the room, the *Vice-officialis*, on being shown the docket-file kept by the Notary, announced that all the witnesses and experts who were to be called in the case had been heard. He then asked the parties and their attorneys whether they had any more information which they wished to lay before the Tribunal.[36] Since both sides were willing to rest their cases at this point, the *Vice-officialis* decreed[37] the "conclusion of the case," i.e. the termination of the period of proof,[38] and the "publication of the process," i.e. the opening of the entire record for the inspection of the parties and their advocates with permission to obtain such copies therefrom as they should desire.[39]

Since the parties and their attorneys had been present at all the hearings, so that they were already aware of all that had been said and done in the Tribunal,[40] the *Vice-officialis* ordered the attorneys to present their briefs in five days.[41] These briefs were to be typewritten with a copy for himself and each of the Synodal Judges as well as for the opposing side and for the *Promotor Justitiae*.[42] He further ordered that the briefs should not cover

[36] Cf. Can. 1860, §2.
[37] Cf. Can. 1860, §§1, 3.
[38] Cf. Can. 1861.
[39] Cf. Can. 1858; 1859.
[40] Cf. Can. 1782, §1.
[41] Cf. Can. 1862; 1634, §2.
[42] Cf. Can. 1863, §§1, 2.

more than fifteen (15) pages of double-space typing.[43] Five days after the presentation of the briefs the answers of each party to the brief of his opponent were to be presented.[44] After reading this decree, he announced the session adjourned.

By this time the docket-file which the Notary kept on the table before him showed the following:

Tribunal of the Diocese of————

Civil Case No. 28

Parties
- Plaintiff —Faber, Frank W.
- Defendant—Parish of St. Mary, Jordan, *per* Rev. John Wall, pastor (permission from Bishop, 10-VIII-45) Doc. 7

Attorneys
- Plaintiff —Rev. Matthew Arnold (gratuitous, 3-VIII-45) Doc. 1
  - at-law and in-fact (5-VIII-45) Doc. 2
- Defendant—Revs. William Brockheim and Arthur Brown at-law (9-VIII-45) Doc. 5
  - Mr. James D. Monahan, in-fact (9-VIII-45) Doc. 6

Bill introduced 6-VIII-45 Doc. 3

Lists of witnesses
- Presented
  - Plaintiff 6-VIII-45 Doc. 4
  - Defendant 13-VIII-45 Doc. 8
  - *Promotor Justitiae* 13-VIII-45 Doc. 9
- Exchanged 13-VIII-45 Doc. 10
- Returned 16-VIII-45 Doc. 20

Session I, 7-VIII-45
- Bill accepted Doc. 11
- Decree to summon defendant Doc. 12
  - reissued 8-VIII-45 Doc. 13
- Decree to summon plaintiff Doc. 14
- Decree to summon *Promotor Justitiae* Doc. 15

[43] Cf. Can. 1864.

[44] Cf. Can. 1865.

Session II, 13-VIII-45		
Counter-claim of defendant presented		Doc. 16
accepted		Doc. 17
Sequestration order issued to Rev. James Doxey, V. F.		Doc. 18
Joinder of issues		Doc. 19
Session III, 17-VIII-45		
Decree to summon		Doc. 21
Plaintiff and wife		
Defendant		
Promotor Justitiae		
Witnesses		
Session IV, 23-VIII-45		
Hearing of plaintiff	oath taken√	Test. 1
Hearing of defendant *per* pastor	oath taken√	Test. 16
Decree to produce financial records		Doc. 22
Decree appointing Fr. Morford, C.P.A., as expert		Doc. 23
Session V, 24-VIII-45		
Hearing of plaintiff's wife	oath taken√	Test. 28
Hearing of Charles Lawson, M.D.	oath taken√	Test. 38
Decree appointing Maurice White, M.D. as expert		Doc. 24
Session VI, 26-VIII-45		
Hearing of Mr. Arthur Eggleston, grocer	oath taken√	Test. 48
Hearing of Mr. William Fink, butcher	oath taken√	Test. 54
Hearing of Mr. John Emmons, merchant	oath taken√	Test. 59
Hearing of Mr. Ralph Agostino, mover	oath taken√	Test. 64
Hearing of Mr. Jack Agostino, mover	oath taken√	Test. 66
Hearing of Mr. Sam Rieber, janitor	oath taken√	Test. 68
Session VII, 28-VIII-45		
Hearing of Mrs. Elsie Wagner, housewife	oath taken√	Test. 70
Hearing of Mrs. Mary Miller, housewife	oath taken√	Test. 76
Hearing of Mrs. Nancy Gruber,		

housewife	oath taken√	Test. 82
Decree to visit scene judicially		Doc. 25
Session VIII, 29-VIII-45		
Judicial vist to scene of accident		
Hearing of Mr. William Bond, contractor	oath taken√	Test. 88
Session IX, 30-VIII-45		
Hearing of Maurice White, M.D.	oath taken√	Test. 93
Decree to summon Alfred Rowan, M.D.		Doc. 26
Hearing of Rev. Alvin Morford, C.P.A.	oath taken√	Test.103
Hearing of Alfred Rowan, M.D.	oath taken√	Test.114
Conclusion of case decreed 30-VIII-45		
Publication of the process decreed 30-VIII-45		Doc. 27
Briefs to be presented 4-IX-45		
Answers to briefs to be presented 10-IX-45		
Oral discussion		
Sentence		
Appeal		
Execution		

(to be continued)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

The Mission Intention for the month of February, 1946, is "Christian Zeal toward Infidels."

Answers to Questions

CHAPLAIN'S FACULTY

Question: In the faculties of military chaplains (P. II, 13, c) it is stated that in those places where war is being waged these priests may absolve the faithful from all sins and censures, with the obligation on the part of the penitent of having recourse within six months after the conclusion of the war to the Sacred Penitentiary for its mandates, under penalty of reincidence, if there is question of censures most specially reserved to the Holy See, or of that censure mentioned in the decree of the Sacred Penitentiary *Lex sacri caelibatus* of April 18, 1936. Will you please explain this faculty, and particularly the significance of the last clause?

Answer: According to Canon 2254, § 1, any confessor can absolve in the sacramental forum from any censures *latae sententiae*, in whatever manner they may be reserved, if the case is urgent—that is, if the censures cannot be observed externally without the danger of grave scandal or infamy, or if it is hard for the penitent to remain in the state of grave sin during the period required to have the absolution granted by a competent superior. However, when absolution has been granted in such a case by a confessor not possessing the special faculty, recourse must be had within a month to the Sacred Penitentiary, or to some superior endowed with the requisite faculties, to receive a mandate. If such recourse is neglected beyond the stipulated period (supposing it can be made without grave inconvenience), the penitent again incurs the censure.

On April 18, 1936, the Sacred Penitentiary issued a decree, *Lex sacri caelibatus*, restricting this ruling of Canon 2254, § 1, and confirmed this decree on May 4, 1937 (Cf. *AAS*, XXVIII, 242; XXIX, 283). The restriction imposed by this decree referred to the case in which a priest has attempted marriage, and is now repentant and fully resolved to observe his obligation of chastity, but for some grave reason wishes to continue to live with the partner of his sin, as brother and sister. The decree ordained that the excommunication incurred by such a priest is so re-

served to the Sacred Penitentiary that no one, except in the case of danger of death, can ever absolve from it, notwithstanding any faculty granted either by Canon 2254, § 1, or by privilege, or finally by any other law whatsoever.

Yet, the chaplains' faculty in question gives our army and navy chaplains the faculty to absolve a priest even in the case so explicitly excepted by the *Lex sacri caelibatus*, imposing the obligation on the penitent to have recourse to the Sacred Penitentiary for its mandates (under penalty of reincidence) within six months after the close of the war. This same stipulation holds in regard to any other censure reserved most specially to the Holy See. Hence, those who receive absolution for any other censure besides that referred to in *Lex sacri caelibatus*, and those most specially reserved to the Holy See, need not have any subsequent recourse.

The following points should be noted: First, a priest who has been absolved from the censure consequent on any attempted marriage may receive the sacraments only after the manner of a lay person; he may not function as a priest by virtue of this absolution. Second, the power which the chaplain enjoys in this matter may be employed only in favor of (a) the faithful who are serving with, or whose services are dedicated in any way to the armed forces; (b) prisoners of war, if the chaplain himself should happen to be a prisoner; (c) all the faithful who come to the chaplain in those places where war is being waged. Third, the faculty in question is numbered among those faculties which were granted in the course of World War II, to be in force only during that War.

A DOCTOR'S CO-OPERATION

Question: Before the war a Catholic doctor of my parish, when requested by married women to fit them with contraceptive devices, refused to perform this service, for I had told him it would be gravely sinful for him to do so. However, in the course of his military service the doctor proposed the question to three chaplains, and was told that he could lawfully fit devices for non-Catholic, but not Catholic women. The arguments given by these chaplains were these: (1) Non-Catholic women do not consider contraception wrong; since then, their sin is merely material, it is not forbidden to co-operate with them; (2) If a

Catholic doctor refuses their request, they will have the contraceptive device fitted by some one else; hence, his refusal would have no practical value; (3) We can argue by analogy with the Catholic lawyer, who may undertake a divorce case for a non-Catholic, but not for a Catholic.

The doctor has now returned home and is resuming his regular practice. He is puzzled about the contradictory opinions he has received concerning his problem. Will you please discuss this case?

Answer: As the case was presented the pastor was certainly correct. A doctor who fits a woman with a contraceptive device co-operates toward the sins she is thereby enabled to commit. His co-operation is material, not formal; but it is so proximate in the order of material co-operation that, considering the heinous nature of the sin toward which it concurs and the disastrous effects of this sin on society, only a most grave reason would justify the doctor in performing this service. Thus, if a doctor were threatened with death or with a long term in prison in the event of a refusal, he might be allowed to accede to the woman's request. But the mere fact that his practice would be considerably diminished if he turned away all women who sought this type of co-operation would certainly not be a justifying reason—and, as the case is proposed, this seems to be the only reason that could be alleged.

The arguments adduced by the chaplains for the lawfulness of such co-operation in the case of non-Catholic women can be easily refuted: (1) Co-operation toward an intrinsically evil act is forbidden, even when the sin of the principal agent is merely material because of his or her good faith. At most it would follow from this circumstance that a less weighty reason would be required to justify material co-operation than in the case when the sin is presumably formal on the part of the principal agent. But in the present problem, on account of the proximity of the doctor's co-operation and the gravity of the sin involved, a very serious reason, such as those mentioned above, would be required even when it can be prudently judged that the chief perpetrators are invincibly ignorant of the sinfulness of their actions. (2) The fact that these women would have someone else fulfil their request if the Catholic doctor refused does not substantially alter the case. If this argument were admitted, all kinds of untenable

conclusions could be drawn about the co-operation of Catholics in abortion, sterilization, etc. (3) To liken the case of the doctor co-operating toward contraception with the case of a lawyer who undertakes a divorce case is quite illogical. Contraception is intrinsically wrong; not so (very probably) the procuring of a civil divorce (Cf. Sabetti-Barrett, *Compendium Theologiae Moralis* [New York, 1929], n. 559). The intrinsic evil in the latter case is the attempted marriage after divorce; and when a lawyer forsees the probability of this occurrence, he is co-operating materially toward the remarriage. However, even in this event, his co-operation is not so proximate as is that of the doctor in the present case; and so the lawyer would not need so grave a reason to justify him as would the doctor. Nevertheless, a very good reason is necessary to justify the lawyer even in the case of a non-Catholic party; hence the principle laid down by the chaplains, that a Catholic lawyer may undertake a divorce case for non-Catholics, is not to be admitted in its unqualified form (Cf. "The Catholic Lawyer," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CIX, 4 [Oct. 1944], 278).

WHICH DEBT SHOULD BE PAID?

Question: When a man is in debt for food, rent, clothing, etc., should he pay these bills in preference to contributing to the church, supposing he cannot satisfy both obligations?

Answer: Strictly speaking, it would seem that the obligation of parishioners to support their pastors and provide for the material needs of the church is an obligation of commutative justice, for it is based on a quasi-contract (Cf. Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theologiae Moralis* [Paris, 1931], II, n. 1120; Prümmer, *Manuale Theologiae Moralis*, [Frei. im Br., 1936] II, n. 499). If one accepted this principle literally, the debtor in question should follow the rules laid down by theologians regarding the order in which creditors are to be paid, assigning to the church its due place or share in the application of these rules. However, in practice, according to the opinion of reliable theologians, the debt of the parishioner to his church can be regarded as one which binds only in legal justice, and the failure to fulfil this obligation is not to be condemned as gravely sinful, as long as the pastor is not thereby put in grave need or the other members of the parish

seriously overburdened (Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa Theologiae Moralis* [Paris, 1938], II, n. 708; Kenrick, *Theologia Moralis* [Malines, 1861], Tr. IV, n. 64). Accordingly, when a person is forced to choose between paying bills to tradesmen and contributing to the support of the church, he should elect to pay the former. This is merely an application of the principle that a debt which certainly binds in commutative justice and *per se sub gravi* is to be given the preference over one which is to be regarded as an obligation of legal justice, binding only *sub levi*.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

CANDLES AND CANDLESTICKS

Question: Is there any legislation with reference to the multi-branched candelabra which are used for Benediction or exposition of the Blessed Sacrament? Is there any basis in fact for the contention that the number of candles is to be reckoned by the number of bases and not the number of candles which each base supports. In other words, that a five- or seven-branched candlestick counts as one in determining the number of candles?

Answer: It is true that both the Missal (*Rub. Gen. Miss.* XX) and the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. I, Cap. 12, 11, 12) in treating of the candles to be lighted for Mass speak of candelabra, each supporting a single candle. Thus the Missal (*loc. cit.*) prescribes that on the altar to be used for the celebration of Mass the cross be placed in the middle and flanked by at least two candlesticks, one on each side. Again, the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (*loc. cit.*) directs that six candelabra, three on each side of the crucifix, ornament the high altar, the number to be increased to seven when the diocesan bishop pontificates.

On the other hand, the Congregation of Rites (D. 3480) and the *Instructio Clementina* (VI) legislating respectively for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and the Forty Hours' Adoration, speak of *lumina*, or *candelae*, when determining the number of lights which are to burn. Our conclusion is that there is no objection to multi-branched candlesticks to hold the required number of candles to be lighted for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament but that for Mass single candlesticks should be used, equal in number to the candles prescribed, so that a pair of three-

branched candlesticks would be incorrect, if used for the six candles which should burn at High Mass.

THE CHALICE IN THE HANDS OF THE CORPSE

Question: I notice with regret that there is a decline in the old custom of placing a chalice in the hands of the body of a deceased priest when it is prepared for the viewing of the remains. It seems a pity that this bit of symbolism is disappearing. What is the law on the subject?

Answer: The liturgical books make no reference to placing a chalice in the hands of the body of a deceased bishop or priest. The Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. 1, 12, 13) directs that the corpse is to be clothed in all the priestly vestments, maniple, stole, and chasuble to be violet in color. The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. II, Cap. 38, 10) makes a similar provision for bishops; the deceased prelate is to be vested in all the pontifical vestments, as for solemn Mass, and, in addition, a cross is to be placed in the hands of the body. In neither case is there any mention of arranging a chalice and paten in the hands.

The best authoritative support for the use of the chalice and paten in this connection is one of toleration, found in Decree 2915, 9, of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. In a reply of the same Congregation to the master of ceremonies of the *Cathedral of Cadiz*, dated June 8, 1899, (*ASS*, XXI, 751f.), the practice is approved where it is of long tradition, but with the provision: *dummodo calix adhibeatur qui Missae non inserviat.*

For our own poor part, we find this custom a decidedly grotesque one. The chalice, *in casu*, has to be placed at right angles to the body of the deceased in a position in which he never held it during life. So, we do not share our correspondent's regret at the decline of the practice of decorating the priestly cadaver with a chalice standing upright on the lower chest. Indeed, we hope to see it progressively more honored in the breach than in the observance.

ST. ANASTASIA ON CHRISTMAS DAY

Question: What is the explanation of the commemoration of St. Anastasia in the second Mass of Christmas Day? It seems

quite out of place liturgically to commemorate a feast of simple rite on a double of the first class.

Answer: The response to the above query is based on historical rather than liturgical grounds, as ordinarily a simple feast passes without observance when it occurs on a feast which ranks as a *duplex primae classis*. The first Mass of Christmas, now proper for midnight but formerly offered at cock-crow, i.e., about two o'clock in the morning, is the Mass at the conclusion of the preparatory vigil. The third Mass, celebrated after Tierce, is the real Mass of the feast. In early medieval times, it was the custom for the Pope to say the first Mass in the basilica of St. Mary Major, *ad praesepe*. On his way to St. Peter's to celebrate the Mass of the day, he used to stop at the church of St. Anastasia to say Mass enroute to please the Byzantine colony in Rome. This celebration was naturally in the early morning and hence the Mass is now marked *ad auroram*. This second Mass was in honor of St. Anastasia, to which, in the Gregorian sacramentary a commemoration of Christmas was added. With the decline of Byzantine influence in Rome, it was of St. Anastasia that the commemoration was made, the Mass being a second one in honor of the Nativity of Our Lord. This custom has perdured ever since in the anomalous commemoration of a simple feast on one of the greatest feasts of the year. The Martyrology still retains the account of the *Natalis Sanctae Anastasiae* on Christmas Day, telling of her martyrdom along with two hundred men and seventy women during the persecution of Diocletian.

SISTERS AS CONGREGATIONAL CHOIR LEADERS

Question: Are Sisters of religious orders and congregations permitted to direct the singing of the people at liturgical functions? Some pastors permit nuns to stand on a platform in front of the sanctuary, from which with much swinging of arms, they lead the congregation in singing at Mass.

Answer: The legislation of the Church could hardly have been epitomized in the 2414 canons of the *Codex Juris* had it taken cognizance of all possible abuses. So, while we know of no legal prohibition of the practice mentioned above, it does seem decidedly incongruous. We imagine that it would not square with the more definite regulations concerning the conduct of nuns

in the books of rules and customs proper to the various sisterhoods. At the risk of being denounced as reactionary, we see the same incongruity in a lay director, standing up before the altar, to direct the singing with the inevitable calisthenics and grimaces, which seems always to accompany the art of conducting.

THE STANDING *VERSUS* THE HANGING CRUCIFIX

Question: Is it not more correct to have as the altar cross a crucifix which stands on the altar table rather than one which is suspended above the altar? What is the law on the subject?

Answer: In treating of the furnishing of the altar the Missal (*Rub. Gen.* XX) does state that the crucifix should be stationed on the altar between the candlesticks. Likewise, the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. I, 12, 11) supposes that the cross stands on the altar in the middle of the six candlelabra. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, however, has decided (No. 2621) that no altar crucifix is required if there is above the altar a Crucifixion group or a picture (altar-piece) representing our Lord on the cross. *A fortiori*, we conclude, a hanging crucifix is an adequate and legitimate substitute for a cross resting on the altar itself. Either the standing or the suspended crucifix, therefore, is correct for the celebration of Mass. It is true that the standing variety is the one pictured in the above-cited passages from the Missal and the *Caeremoniale* but there can be no doubt as to the liceity of the hanging crucifix. The important thing is that a crucifix, not a cross without a *corpus*, be used and that it be of sufficient size to be seen bv priest and people (Cf. S.R.C. No. 4136).

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE NEED OF THE STATE FOR THE CHURCH

The great principles of the State are those of the Church, and if the State would but keep within its own province, it would find the Church its truest ally and best benefactor. She upholds obedience to the magistrate; she recognizes his office as from God; she is the preacher of peace, the sanction of law, the first element of order, and the safeguard of morality, and that without possible vacillation or failure; she may be fully trusted; she is a sure friend, for she is undefectible and undying.

—Cardinal Newman, in *Difficulties of Anglicans* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), I, 175.

Analecta

The Allocution delivered by our Holy Father to the Cardinals in response to their felicitations on his feast day is published in the June, 1945,[1] number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, the latest to come to hand. In it our Holy Father adverts to the ruin caused by the war, contrasting the circumstances of the present with those of the same occasion six years previously when war seemed inevitable, but when its dire consquences had not been adequately anticipated. The conflict with National Socialism is reviewed and the unequivocal position taken by Pope Pius XI in the Encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*, in which notice was given to the world of the irreconcilable conflict between the Nazi ideology and Catholic doctrine. The concordat with Germany of 1933 is defended as providing a strong fortress of defence in the days of oppression that resulted upon the issuance of the Encyclical. Hope is expressed that the undeniable virtues of the conservative Germans will restore the morale of the nation in defeat. A warning is uttered against the imposition on weaker nations of a hegemony that will not differ in character from that which the war was waged to overcome. Prayers are offered in union with the sufferings that still confront mankind in its struggle for world peace, that a true peace based on right principles may eventually emerge from the havoc wrought in the world. The prayers and sacrifices of clergy and laity are enlisted and in return for their response the Apostolic Blessing is imparted.

In this number one also finds the Apostolic Constitution of Oct. 21, 1944,[2] redistributing portions of the territory belonging to the Archdiocese of Cincinnati and the Diocese of Columbus, and establishing the Diocese of Steubenville. The following appointments to Sees are also listed:[3]

Nov. 11, 1944: Most Rev. Joseph Ritter, D.D., raised to the rank of Archbishop, Ordinary of the See of Indianapolis; Most Rev. Henry Grimmelsman, D.D., to the See of Evansville; and Most Rev. John Bennett, D.D., to the See of Lafayette, Indiana;

March 10, 1945: Most Rev. John Mussio, D.D., to the See of Steubenville;

---

[1] *AAS*, XXXVII (1945), 159. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 153. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

April 14, 1945: Most Rev. Andrew J. Brennan, D.D., to the Titular See of Telmisso;

April 21, 1945: Most Rev. Louis Kelleher, D.D., to the Titular See of Tene, and Auxiliary to the Archbishop of Boston;

May 5, 1945: Most Rev. William Arnold D.D., to the Titular See of Phocaea.

Three congratulatory letters of our Holy Father also appear in the June number, conveying the Apostolic Benediction to the recipients and to their associates. One, dated May 8, 1945,[4] is addressed to His Eminence, Raffaele Carlo Cardinal Rossi, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration; a second[5] is addressed to His Eminence, Alessio Cardinal Ascalesi, Archbishop of Naples, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination; and the third dated, as the previous one, May 20, 1945,[6] addressed to His Eminence, Giovanni Battista Nasalli-Rocca di Corneliano, also on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated Jan. 26, 1945,[7] records the signing by our Holy Father of the Commission for the introduction of the Cause of Maria Teresa Ledóchowska, foundress of the Sodality of St. Peter Claver for the African Missions.

A letter of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, dated Dec. 21, 1944,[8] and addressed to the hierarchy throughout the world, requires the introduction of pedagogy as a branch of study in both the philosophical and theological courses: one hour a week during the two years of the philosophical course and one-half the time assigned to pastoral theology in the theological course. In the latter course, it will consist entirely of catechetics, with seminars and practical lectures. In the philosophical course, the fundamentals of pedagogy are to be imparted, preferably by the professor of philosophy on account of the close connection existing between pedagogy, psychology and ethics. This course is also to be supplemented with seminars and practical exercises. The course itself is to give information on the concept of education; its purpose; its laws; the means it employs; the nature of the person to be educated, especially in regard to

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 157.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 158.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 170.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 173.

his environment; the qualities of the educator and his obligations; the rights of the Church, of the State, and of the family; and the agencies devoted to education: the family, the school, the college, recreational and religious associations.

JEROME D. HANNAN

ARCHBISHOP SPALDING'S ADDRESS TO POPE PIUS IX

In the hall [of the American College in Rome] the Pontiff again spoke a few kind and paternal words, and Archbishop Spalding, in the name of the American Church, clergy and laity, made an address to the Pope in Latin. The discourse was excellent in language and happy in thought. His Grace referred to the fact that Pius VI had given us our first bishop (Dr. Carroll, of Baltimore); Pius VII had multiplied dioceses, and given us our first archiepiscopal see; and he, Pius IX had established six other archiepiscopal sees. So that in a country where sixty years ago there was but one bishop, there are now sixty, three-fourths of whom are here in Rome to attend the general council. Toward the end of his discourse the good archbishop brought in a few touches of true American wit. This is what Italians would scarcely hazard on such an occasion, and it was to them unexpected. Even the Pope looked for a moment puzzled, as if he could not conjecture what was coming; but as he caught the point a smile spread over his countenance, and the smile developed into a hearty laugh.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, *A Retrospect of Fifty Years* (Baltimore and New York: John Murphy Company, 1916), I, 62 f.

The young pastor of a Negro parish in the South, walking in his miniature garden, couldn't help overhearing a group of his junior parishioners on the other side of the high stone wall.

"Ol' man Smith's peaches nice and ripe!" one of the boys' voices said. "Le's all go get some!"

"We can't do that—we's Cafflics an' it's stealin' an' Father says stealin's a sin!" another voice protested.

And then a third voice, tiny and innocent, made itself heard.

"Lissen! Tha's all right. Ah's on'y six, an' ah ain't reached the use o' reason yet! Ah'll steal 'em an' we'll all eat 'em!"

Book Reviews

RUFINUS OF AQUILEIA (345-411), HIS LIFE AND TIMES. By Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945. Pp. xviii + 248. $2.50.

When one considers that until this book appeared there was little generally available in the way of a large-scale biography of the Presbyter of Aquileia other than the *Vita* by Fontanini dating from 1742 (reprinted in *MPL* 21, 75-294), he can sense the importance of this present dissertation.

The Rufinus of these pages is a many-sided figure: a pilgrim widely traveled in both East and West, yet never more content than when confined within his own monastic cell; a scholar formed in the best schools of Latin learning yet destined to spread abroad the treasures of Greek theological science. Part of his life was spent in polemic with St. Jerome. Now Fr. Murphy has shown that it was not the major part and that, in the end, it interfered but little with the man's central task of turning Greek tracts into Latin treatises.

Rather a piece of sound research than a strict literary biography, this study quite supports the author's contention that his subject played "an essential part in the development of the Christian way of life in the society of which he was a member" (p. 226). Evident throughout the work is Fr. Murphy's acquaintance with recent periodical literature and his knack of summarizing a problem in a footnote. Here and there, indeed, some references are in error. Perhaps those most needful of correction are the volume numbers assigned the review *Recherches de Science Religieuse;* on pp. xv, 67, 140, 144, 241, for instance, the reference to *RSR* 37 (1937) should be to vol. 27; on pages 7, 238, *RSR* 14 and 15 (1934, 1935) should read *RSR* 24 and 25. And then on occasion there are discrepancies between the dates given in the text and those listed in the very useful *Regesta* which concludes the work. Thus p. 126 correctly places the death of Pope Siricius on Nov. 26, 399, though the *Regesta* has Nov. 19; here also 410 is assigned as the year of Rufinus' own demise while the title page, in accord with Cavallera, employs 411.

The index is both good and adequate, as is the bibliography of six pages. Perhaps it would be better if a number of articles used by Fr. Murphy and noted in his index appeared also in the bibliography; the fine material on the relation between Rufinus and Bachiarius listed in a footnote to p. 135 is a case in point. Equally deserving of inclusion therein is William H. Fremantle: "Prolegomena on the Life and Works

of Rufinus" in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (ed. Schaff and Wace, 1892), 2nd series, III, pp. 405-13 and the English translations which follow. And at p. 179, Charles A. Heurtley's edition of the *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum* (reprint, Oxford, Parker, 1916) merited attention.

Certainly an attractive feature of Fr. Murphy's book is the way in which he has fitted his analysis of the Rufinian literary productions into the general framework of the life. Thus the study is not divided artificially into "life" and "works"; rather are these latter considered naturally against the background of events which accompanied their composition.

Apart from an evident slip as to the date of the *Decretum Gelasianum* on p. x (the correct dating is given on p. 223) few points only call for revision in this volume. No doubt there will be some disagreement about the assigning of the late sixth century as the date of foundation of the episcopal see of Concordia, Rufinus' birthplace (p. 1). For we have inscriptions no later than 426-27 which speak of *sancta ecclesia Civitatis Concordiensium* and a sermon seemingly of the same period wherein Concordia is described as *ornata . . . summi sacerdotis officio.* On these grounds, Francesco Lanzoni (*Le Diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII* (Faenza, 1927), II, pp. 899 ff.) argues to a bishopric dating from the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century. And it may also be observed that in a note on p. 38 the author apparently accepts Duchesne's calculation of Dec. 19, 401, for the death of Pope Anastasius, though Karl Holl showed in the *Sitzungsberichte d. k. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften* (1916, IX, pp. 251 ff.) that December, 402, is the better date.

If there is to be other criticism of Fr. Murphy's work, one suspects that it will concern the chronology followed in his chapters on the Origenistic conflict. Not that his own chronology does not enjoy strong probability; it does indeed, for it is in agreement with that of Ferdinand Cavallera's masterly *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre* (Louvain-Paris, 1922, 2 vols.). But there are diverse solutions that are also good. Some years before Cavallera, two German scholars, K. Holl and Adolf Jülicher, published in the Berlin *Sitzungsberichte* just mentioned (1916, IX, pp. 226-55, 256-75) two chronologies of their own. Fr. Murphy refers, of course, to these contributions (p. 66 n.) as does Cavallera, yet neither really employs them in his study. Indeed Cavallera admits quite frankly (II, 31 n.) that it was only after his own work had appeared that he first became acquainted with them.

There are differences amongst the three—Holl, Jülicher, Cavallera—upon several matters. Take, for instance, their interpretations of the *totum triennium* mentioned in Jerome's *contra Joannem Hierosolymi-*

tanum, ch. 14 (*MPL* 23, 366B); for Holl (p. 229), it comes to an end with the letter of Epiphanius to John and the ordination of Paulinianus; for Jülicher (pp. 257 f.), with the composition of the *c. Joan. Hier.* itself; for Cavallera (II, 33), with John's *Apology* which is held to antedate the *c. Joan. Hier.* by some four or five months. And even though all three agree in commencing the *triennium* with the friction that followed the Jerusalem sermons of John and Epiphanius, still for Holl (p. 241), the sermons fall in the paschal period of 390; for Jülicher (pp. 258, 264), in the autumn of 392; for Cavallera (I, 208 ff.; II, 157), in the Eastertide of 393.

Because of differences such as these—minor at times, major at others—it would have been well had Fr. Murphy weighed as thoroughly the suggestions of Holl and Jülicher as he has those of Cavallera and then given us the benefit of his own judgment as to which of the three has the strongest position upon points where they differ.

Yet, after all, this is no more than a negative defect; for the rest, one finds in this work a study abreast of the late findings in its field. From it, Rufinus comes off a character at least as honest and sincere as Jerome, if not as talented. To have put forth such a rehabilitation is commendation enough for any scholar.

Fr. Murphy deserves high praise for this dissertation which now becomes the standard treatise on Rufinus of Aquileia. That it appears as one of its *Studies in Mediaeval History* will be a matter of pride for The Catholic University of America.

HENRY G. J. BECK

RELIGION IN THE POST-WAR WORLD. Edited by Willard L. Sperry. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945. Four volumes: Vol. I, RELIGION AND OUR DIVIDED DENOMINATIONS, pp. ix + 115; Vol. II, RELIGION AND OUR RACIAL TENSIONS, pp. viii + 115; Vol. III, THE RELIGION OF THE SOLDIER AND THE SAILOR, pp. ix + 106; Vol. IV, RELIGION AND EDUCATION, pp. ix + 114. $6.00.

Viewed in terms of their general title, *Religion in the Post-War World,* these volumes offer a complex task for the Catholic critic. With the exception of Fr. LaFarge's article on Roman Catholicism, these essays are a search for religion rather than an affirmation of its place in the post-war world. The authors variously equate religion with pietistic secularism, pagan humanism, humanitarianism, or brotherhood of one kind or another. The idea that religion might possibly be concerned with God and His purposes is largely ignored. The articles are often a source of irritation for a reactionary who thinks that it is necessary to define your terms if clear ideas are to be presented. For one trained in the Catholic theological tradition, the vol-

umes are a nightmare of amorphous conceptions, blithe assumptions, and critical judgments that are untouched by any appreciation of the life, character, and effectiveness of historical (Catholic) Christianity. Just to pick out these defects and comment on them would require pages. In many cases finding a point of departure for criticism is like trying to carry a handful of fog into the house. For example, Mr. Archibald MacLeish writing on "Humanism" effectively proves that in matters of religion he should have stayed with obscure poetry. Likewise typical is Mr. Payson Smith's essay on "The Public Schools and Religious Education"; so effectively does he avoid coming to grips with the real issue that one wonders why he bothered to go through all that mental shadow-boxing.

By way of specific criticism one point ought to be noted. Implicit or explicit in many of the articles is impatience and resentment with the Catholic Church for its unbending attitude on dogmatic truth and on religious unity. Despite the fact that Fr. LaFarge presents the Catholic position clearly and cogently, most of his fellow contributors did not read his essay or have no appreciation of the logic of that position—let alone its validity. It certainly seems strange that a Protestant can speak of divine revelation and then assume that men can dispose of those portions of divine revelation that impede his particular conceptions of unity. Thus, Professor McNeil of the Union Theological Seminary holds that Protestantism was originally a movement towards the union of churches which is only now finding its actualization in the plans for a World Council of Protestant Churches. But he also maintains that such a union ought to include the Unitarian, Universalist and other churches designated as liberal. He then goes on to point out that the present formula of union is unsatisfactory, *viz.*, "the churches that accept Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour." Accordingly he tells us that "it is not unlikely that the terms of membership will be revised in the permanent plan; but to reach a formula inclusive enough to give membership both to the liberal groups of churches and to those that stand on guard for the traditional trinitarianism is a task sure to present no little difficulty." Imagine discussing formulas of this kind with the St. Paul who wrote to the Galatians that "if we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel other than that we have preached to you, let him be anathema." For even a passing acquaintance with the history of apostolic Christianity makes it clear that its character as a divine revelation is utterly essential to all their preaching and authority.

While these articles are of little or no value, if judged by their purpose, they may be of help to one who deals with non-Catholics. For many of the authors evidence a sincere quest for some spiritual solution to the problems that harass modern man. And frequently with

only the remnants of western and Christian culture to aid them they are heartbreakingly aware of the need for spiritual peace. Some think that it lies somehow in an external unity through which vitality will be restored to what Christianity they possess; they do not realize that the very essence of the Gospel of Christ is that this unity springs from the union of the Vine with the branches. Others recognize with bitter clarity the insufficiency of man and the emptiness of secularism untouched by the spirit, but they grope in a lightless maze. Still others regard Christianity as outmoded or dead and seek a "new" solution in brotherhood or social welfare or in an abounding faith in man. Apparently they do not know that history is a vast graveyard of similar efforts, and, in fact, that their own spiritual isolation and needs stem from just such solutions. In short, then, these articles offer a very useful cross-section of the religious mind of non-Catholic America with all of its confusion, obscurity, dangerous tendencies, spiritual aspirations and needs. In this lies the only value of these volumes.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

AUGUSTINE'S QUEST OF WISDOM. Life and Philosophy of the Bishop of Hippo. By Vernon J. Bourke, Ph.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. xi + 323. $3.00.

This book is a popular study in the best sense of the term: it is most readable and interesting and based upon a conscientious study of the vast literary estate of St. Augustine, conjoined with an ever-evident search in the equally vast investigation previously made of this estate. The fact that the volume is not limited to an inquiry into the genesis and progress of St. Augustine's thought, but is as biographical as it is recreative of his philosophy, is justified by the addition of the sub-title.

In the first part, "The Rhetorician" (pp. 1-47), the author gives a most attractive account in three chapters of the earliest phases of Augustine's life: the years of his youth in the home of his parents, Patricius and Monnica, and in the schools of Tagaste and Madaura; his study of rhetoric and his acceptance of Manicheism at Carthage; and his career as a teacher of rhetoric at Tagaste, Carthage, Rome, and Milan.

The second part, "The Christian Philosopher" (pp. 48-122), repeats the famous story of Augustine's gradual conversion, following his great disillusionment on meeting the Manichean bishop, Faustus. In this period (384-390) there is recorded his complete abandonment of Manicheism, his groping for truth over the errant paths of Academic skepticism, Stoicism, Epicureanism, and astrology, until he advanced *a corporibus ad . . . animam atque inde ad eius interiorem vim* (*Confes-*

sions VII, 17, 23), through a growing acquaintance with the Neoplatonists. This, his "intellectual conversion," culminated in his "moral" or "volitional conversion" through the stimulation of Ambrose's sermons, his reading of the Scriptures, and the prayer of Monnica. His "retreat at Cassiciacum" was spent in recovering his intellectual equilibrium, in sifting and rearranging from his past philosophical experience such content of truth as could serve "to clarify by the light of understanding what he already accepted on faith." These months proved most fruitful, too, in the production of several philosophical dialogues (*Contra Academicos, De Beata Vita, De Ordine*) and the *Soliloquia.* His studies written during the years immediately following his baptism in 387 document a profounder Christianization of his abiding basically Platonic thought. His theories of judgment and knowledge already reveal the presence of the celebrated theory of divine illumination. He also began his polemical writings against the Manicheans and established a monastic community at Tagaste.

The third and longest period (391-426) of Augustine's career is treated by Bourke under the heading, "The Bishop's Work" (pp. 123-174). In 391 Augustine is seized by the good people of Hippo Regius and promptly ordained by the resident bishop who needed a curate able to speak Latin and Punic. Four or five years later he was consecrated coadjutor bishop. There follows the account of Augustine's incessant labors in the administration of his episcopal office, an office that he yet managed to wed in a most intimate union with a continued life of scholarship, of an unremitting quest of wisdom, of an unceasing literary activity for the Church and against her enemies—the heretics (Manicheans, Donatists, Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians). It is also during this period, 397-400, that his immortal work, the *Confessions,* was written.

A detailed analysis of three other monumental works composed during this period—*De Trinitate* (400-416), *De Genesi ad Litteram* (401-415), and *De Civitate Dei* (413-426)—takes up the bulk of the book's fourth part, entitled, "The Mature Mind of St. Augustine" (pp. 201-302). In the final pages (285-302) of this section, appropriately captioned, "The End Crowns the Work," the author describes the unflagging activities of the septuagenary bishop and his peaceful death on Aug. 28, 430, during the siege of Hippo by the Vandals.

Of course, in writing this book Professor Bourke, a layman, set himself a most formidable task; and he is to be congratulated for presenting the complete Augustine as lucidly and completely as he has done. However, the three monumental works which he examines in the final part caused unusually great difficulties, as they naturally would, considering also, for example, that St. Augustine himself termed his books on the Trinity *nimis operosi,* that the work has never appeared in a critical

edition; that, similarly, the long treatise on the Book of Genesis left the author equally dissatisfied as he reviewed it in the *Retractationes,* that it apparently has never received a complete translation; etc. To the reviewer it seems that Bourke's account of these works suffers somewhat from being too much a book-by-book outline of them, which is valuable, but is not accompanied by sufficiently comprehensive and clear syntheses of the entire works, nor by appraisals of them in the light of anterior and subsequent thought, especially theological thought.

The following matters of detail may also be noted. Though in general the best critical texts are used or referred to, these are sometimes overlooked: thus, for Augustine's *Confessions* (*passim*) Skutella's revision (1934) of the Teubner edition by Knöll should have been employed; Tertullian's *De Anima,* the text of which is referred to *MPL 2* (p. 240, n. 98), appears in *CSEL 20*. That, among the literature used, Bardenhewer's long chapter on St. Augustine in the fourth volume of his *Altkirchliche Literatur* (pp. 434-511) is not mentioned, is most strange. The heresiarch Pelagius is spoken of as having had an "apparently meagre education" (p. 174): quite the opposite is true. The "shadowy figure" referred to on p. 261 and in the Index, is known as Hermes Trismegistus, not Tresmegistus. In mentioning a work by Apuleius of Madaura, the author by a droll lapse imputes (p. 7, n. 18, and Index) to the great philosopher of the circumambulating bare feet a means of conveyance which he evidently did not have nor crave: correct *De Asino Socratis* to read *De Deo Socratis.*

The two appendixes appearing at the end of the book, one containing a chronological table of Augustine's writings and the collections in which these may be found, the other offering a documented chronology of his life, are very valuable additions. Finally, it should be reported also that the publisher of this volume has made himself guilty of a first-class atrocity in the choice of the font for the footnotes. The print is so miserly and miserably small as to make consultation of these notes little short of prohibitory.

J. C. Plumpe

Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel. By F. R. Hoare. With an Introduction by the Very Rev. Msgr. John M. T. Barton, D.D. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. Pp. viii + 160. 10s. 6d.

Many commentators have proposed the theory that there have been accidental inversions in the order of the sections in the fourth Gospel, and have suggested certain transpositions. Meinertz in the *Biblische Zeitschrift* back in 1917 contended that the order of chapters 5 and 6 should be inverted. Lagrange inclined to this theory although he dared

not arrange the text in his commentary on St. John in that order. Others, notably the Protestant Archbishop, Bernard, have been much more drastic in their rearrangement of the order of the Gospel. But the only argument they proposed at length was the improvement of the logical and geographical sequence, and they explained the dislocations as the result of accident or carelessness or deliberate manipulations on the part of the copyist. There is absolutely no manuscript evidence in favor of *pericopai* having been so misplaced.

For the first time we have, as far as I know, a published monograph dealing with this point and attempting to back up the theory of dislocation by an arithmetical argument. But before reviewing the argument itself, let us propose the author's account of what probably happened to bring about the dislocations before any copies of the original had been made.

The scribe had completed the Gospel at the dictation of St. John, writing on a number of sheets of papyrus which were either to be sewed together to form a codex or else pasted together and rolled into a volumen. But before this step could be taken an accident happened. The loose leaves were scattered by the overturning of the table on which they were lying. Mr. Hoare leaves it to our imagination to picture how the table came to be overturned. There are many possibilities. Maybe some of the scribe's children got into a scuffle, as children will do, and accidently upset the table and scattered the leaves of the Gospel. Or, maybe, it was a tornado or an earthquake. That is beside the point. In reassembling the leaves the scribe got them to a certain extent in the wrong order.

Having written them all, he remembered fairly well the original sequence, but not well enough to get the leaves all back into their proper place. Hence the dislocations. But why didn't the scribe consult St. John? That is an embarrassing question, but we may with Mr. Hoare suppose that between the interval of dictating the Gospel and the accident St. John had died. It must not be forgotten that he was a very old man when he composed the Gospel. Or, perhaps, the effort at dictating the Gospel had exhausted him and he fell ill. The scribe read the finished manuscript to the author and got his approval, but before the loose leaves could be pasted or sewed together, the accident happened. They were scattered by a gust of wind, or an accidentally overturned table, and when the scribe went to consult St. John as to whether he had reassembled them in the proper sequence, the venerable old man had fallen into a coma from which he never was to emerge in this life. The result: the disorderly arrangement of *capita* in the original copy which has been perpetuated down to our day.

The foregoing may sound very fantastic, may seem to be a sheer

imaginary hypothesis suspended in mid-air, but it assumes at least some degree of plausibility when we take into consideration the arithmetical argument very carefully elaborated after long and painstaking calculations by Mr. Hoare. He has counted every letter of the alphabet in the fourth Gospel's Greek text according to the critical text of Merk. Mr. Hoare gives his reasons for preferring Merk's to other critical editions. And as a result of that choice Mr. Hoare includes in his calculations 5:3b-4; 7:53-8, 11 and 21:1-25. He then assumes that each leaf had so many lines, so many letters to each line with partial lines to mark the end of a paragraph and three or four blank lines to mark the end of a *caput*. He then rearranges the order of the *capita* in accord with his arithmetical scheme and gets an arrangement of *capita* that is much more satisfactory from the standpoint of logical and geographical sequence.

Mr. Hoare is far from claiming that his argument is demonstrative. He frankly recognizes the difficulties, such as ascertaining to the last letter of the alphabet what was the original text, what contractions and abbreviations were used in the autograph copy, what punctuation marks, if any, were employed, and whether the numbers were written out in full as words or written as numerals in the letters the Greeks used for that purpose. Mr. Hoare also recognizes that his effort is but a beginning in a line of argument which he hopes to see further developed until it will result in moral certitude concerning the original order of the Gospel's *capita*.

To give an idea of the extent of the rearrangement to which Mr. Hoare subjects the fourth Gospel, we here indicate his ordering of the first eight chapters: 1:1-51; 4:3b-43; 2:1-25; 3:1-36; 4:1-3a; 4:44-5, 47; 7:15-24; 6:1-7, 14; 7:25-52; 8:12-28a; 12:34-50; 8:28b-58. In order to enable the reader to appreciate the results of the new arrangement from the standpoint of logical order and geographical consistency, Mr. Hoare gives in the second part of his book the text of the first seventeen chapters of the Gospel according to St. John in the reconstructed order, making use of the Douay Version with slight changes here and there, which he is always careful to indicate.

In this brief review we have given only the most summary account of Mr. Hoare's arithmetical argument. It becomes quite intricate at times, and is developed at length. We can only refer the reader to the book itself, which we think very interesting and provocative.

The argument of Mr. Hoare is sound if we admit his premises. But it seems to this reviewer that there are too many assumptions in his premises to serve as a basis for anything more than a very conjectural conclusion. For example, how sure are we of the exact size of the sheets of papyrus which St. John or his amanuensis used, if indeed they

used papyrus at all; of the number of lines on each page, of the number of letters in each line? Granted that skilled copyists used a standard size sheet of papyrus and that the size of their letters was uniform, what assurance have we that St. John's amanuensis was skilled and conformed to what was common, standard usage? Could he not have been a less skilled scribe, who used a larger than average script, such as St. Paul seems to have used in penning the final words of the epistle to the Galatians? Would every commentator agree to Mr. Hoare's division of the text into paragraphs, so that each leaf of the manuscript must have contained just what the arithmetical scheme requires for the validity of the present argument? Then, too, are there not other suppositions that may be invoked to explain, and explain just as well, the apparent lack of logical order in parts of the fourth Gospel? Maybe St. John wrote a first rough copy or dictated it, then went over it, adding a supplement here and there, with the intention of rearranging and revising the whole, but illness and death intervened to leave that intention unfulfilled and the Gospel in its present state of disorder. Then, too, may we not ask if St. John always wrote with that logical order which we expect from the rhetoricians of the best Greek tradition? After all the oriental mind and education were not those of the western world.

Thus it seems to this reviewer that Mr. Hoare's thesis is impossible now of demonstration. He has shown a great deal of ingenuity and has presented a clever argument, but the conclusion thereof is highly problematical. All students of the fourth Gospel should read Mr. Hoare's stimulating and provocative book. It is an honest and praiseworthy attempt to solve a problem and does pioneer work in a new line of argument which further development and research may bring close to a demonstration.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

PASTORAL SPANISH. By Alphonse Simon, O.M.I. San Antonio: Standard Printing Co., 1945. Pp. xxii + 504. $3.00.

In his introduction Fr. Simon makes an earnest appeal to seminarians who will work in districts having Spanish-speaking Catholics to prepare themselves for this work by learning the Spanish language while still in the seminary. To help them he has written this excellent book which anyone who has the care of souls which includes these people will find profitable.

Book I, 86 pages, is a short Spanish grammar. Whenever possible the words used in the examples build up a vocabulary suitable for instructions, sermons, and announcements. The grammar is better suited for study under a teacher than for self-teaching. This was necessary in

order to include other features of the book which make it unique and so very valuable to the seminarians.

Book II, 255 pages, is called, "Pastoral Conversations." In these Fr. Simon does the seminarian a real service. Not only does he give the grammatical form and vocabulary to hold conversations or instructions ranging in topics through all the sacraments, but he also shows a mastery, born of long years of work, in dealing with the subtle excuses offered for failure to comply with the law, and with the states of mind regarding religion and life in general encountered among the unsophisticated. In his deft handling of ill-instructed and simple people, Fr. Simon teaches not only Spanish but charity, patience, and a deep understanding of the problems of these people.

Book III, 105 pages, has for its title, "The Catechism Explained To a Group of Children." This part also contains valuable lessons in methods and in making the truths of the faith intelligible to the little ones. Any pastor must chuckle as he realizes that the problems that Fr. Simon met in his pastorate are his own, and thank him for the practical hints towards their solution.

It may surprise many to discover that not all of the Spanish-speaking population of our country reside in the West and the Southwestern parts. New York has 133,000, Illinois 34,000, and Michigan 15,000. Each year increasing numbers find their way north towards better opportunities. This book will help all who work with and for these underprivileged children of Our Lady of Guadalupe.

LEO HAGEMANN, C.SS.R.

"THROWING TREASURES AWAY . . ."

In education there has been a similar disintegration, so far as the old Liberal Arts are concerned. Once the pride of Oxford and Cambridge, they were brought over by graduates of Cambridge in the seventeenth century to establish again in the new college that bears John Harvard's name; they flourished in full vigor down to President Eliot's reform, since when all over our country they have fought a losing battle. Worse still, with the growing disintegration of the Protestant Church, religion has been gradually squeezed out of education both in our public schools and in all but the Catholic colleges. No doubt about it. The world is throwing treasures away and entering the Dark Ages again.

—Edward K. Rand, *The Building of Eternal Rome* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), p. 266.

Book Notes

In observance of last year's celebration of the centennial of John Henry Newman's conversion to Catholicism, Sheed and Ward issued a very attractive reprint of *A Newman Synthesis*, by Erich Przywara, S.J. Fr. Przywara is a Newman scholar of considerable reputation, and his book has much to recommend it. The present English version is a condensation of the original six-volume German work. The author's plan, as the publisher's note tells us, "is to reconstitute Newman's thought, systematically and in its completeness, as it was present in Newman's own mind" (p. vii). To this end, quotations from the works of the great Cardinal are grouped under twenty-one general headings ("God," "Preparations for Christianity," "Miracles," "The Church," etc.). Most of these general classifications are further divided into from two to eight sub-sections. Such a synthesis is, of course, no substitute for the reading of Newman's thought in its complete and original form; and all readers will not agree with Fr. Przywara's "Analytical Summaries" which preface the main sections. *A Newman Synthesis*, however, is both interesting for the quotations it reproduces and valuable for its guidance to those sections of Newman's works that treat of the specific topics listed. The book retails for $3.50.

Fremont Rider, a librarian of wide erudition and a writer with a very interesting style, has published *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library* (New York: Hadham Press, 1944), which title might possibly be taken to include subject-matter both recondite and intended for few eyes. But, as a matter of fact, it deals with rather sensational material that should interest most people who can read at all. He attacks and analyzes a problem created by the production of books, a problem which far outstrips that presented several years ago in Ellis Parker Butler's *Pigs is Pigs*. In 1937, for instance, 187,000,000 pieces of printed materials rolled off American presses. Invariably, college and university libraries in America double their book collections every sixteen years, which means, for instance, that the Yale library, to take one example, with 2,748,000 volumes requiring some 80 miles of shelves in 1938, will have about 200,000,000 volumes requiring over 6000 miles of shelves a century hence. And shelving is only one of the many complex problems created by the first production of a book, because Yale would need to increase its staff of catalogers from 200 to 5000 to catalog its books. We perhaps had better not try to imagine where Yale might house its enormous collections a century hence because by that time Harvard will have far outgrown Massaschusetts and Columbia and the New York Public Library will be pushing up from New York.

While the story of the problem is interesting enough, the real interest of the moment is in its contribution towards the solution. Briefly, Mr. Rider's proposal is to put the contents of a book not on the 200 or the 235 pages of paper bound together but to put them instead on the back of a regular size library card (3″x5″). Quite naturally this proposal met with plenty of scepticism and derision as "impossible," "fantastic," and "silly," until Mr. Rider pointed out that such procedure is not only possible but only a modification of regular library procedure used for several years; it is simply a more intensive use of microprint.

Through photography several pages of a book may ordinarily be reproduced on a single page to be read with a magnifying reading machine. This is now common practice. But Mr. Rider, having demonstrated that it is possible to print as many as 250 pages on the 3x5 library card, proposes that this fact be commonly accepted and made the basis for future library planning; through it, he feels, the scholar in his study may be able to enlarge his own private library to near-completeness (for an 80 page pamphlet should be had for eighteen cents and a 500 page book for thirty-six cents in micro-card form), while the large library may be able to solve quite easily many of its baffling problems of book cost, cataloging, shelving, and storage.

Books Received

L'ACTION CATHOLIQUE. By M. Doran, O.P. Montreal, Ottawa: Éditions du Lévrier, 1945. Pp. 192.

AFTER BERNADETTE. By Don Sharkey. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. 166. $2.00.

CARDINALIS HOSII DOCTRINA DE CORPORE CHRISTI MYSTICO. By Rev. Gregorius M. Grabka, O.F.M.Conv. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1945. Pp. xviii + 279. $2.50.

THE CATHOLIC BOOKLIST: 1942-1945. Edited by Sr. Mary Louella, O.P. River Forest, Illinois: Rosary College, 1945. Pp. 101. $0.50.

CATHOLICS AND THE CIVIL WAR. By Rev. Benjamin J. Blied, Ph.D. Milwaukee:, 1945. Pp. 162. $2.50.

CHUNGKING LISTENING POST. By Mark Tennien. New York: Creative Age Press, 1945. Pp. xiv + 201. $1.50.

CONFERENCES OF THE METROPOLITANS OF INDIA. Madras: Good Pastor Press, 1945. Pp. xii + 207.

CONSULAR RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PAPAL STATES, INSTRUCTIONS AND DISPATCHES. Edited with an Introduction by Leo Francis Stock, Ph.D.,LL.D. Washington: The American Catholic Historical Association, 1945. Pp. xxxix + 467. $5.00.

THE EASE ERA. THE JUVENILE OLIGARCHY AND THE EDUCATIONAL TRUST. By Paul Mallon. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. 119. $1.50.

EASTERN CATHOLIC WORSHIP. By Donald Attwater. New York: The Devon-Adair Co., 1945. Pp. xviii + 224. $2.50.

FURTHER DISCOURSES ON THE HOLY GHOST. By Lester M. Dooley, S.V.D. New York, Cincinnati: F. Pustet Co., 1945. Pp. x + 212. $2.50.

HEADS ABOVE THE STARS. By Giles Staab, O.F.M.Cap. New York, Cincinnati: F. Pustet Co., 1945. Pp. xv + 171. $2.00.

THE HEART OF MAN. By Gerald Vann, O.P. New York, Toronto: Longmans Green & Co., 1945. Pp. 182. $2.00.

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES. Vol. XXXIV. Edited by Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D. New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1945. Pp. 189.

HOLINESS FOR ALL. By His Excellency, Norbert Robichaud, Archbishop of Moncton, N. B., Canada. Translated by a Member of the Congregation of the Christian Schools. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Book Shop, 1945. Pp. x +67. $0.75.

INTRODUCTIO AD PHILOSOPHIAM ET LOGICA. By Rev. Inlio Davila, S.J. Mexico: Buena Prensa, 1945. Pp. 298.

THE JESUITS IN OLD OREGON. By William N. Bischoff, S.J. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Inc., 1945. Pp. vii + 258. $3.00.

MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. Vol. II, 1945. New York: Field Afar Press, 1945. Pp. vii + 56. $0.60.

NO DREAMERS WEAK. By Michael de la Bedoyere. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. 168. $2.00.

ONE CONVERT TO ANOTHER. By John M. Riach, C.S.P. Chicago: J. S. Paluch Co., 1945. Pp. 112. $1.00.

ORIENTII COMMONITORIUM. A COMMENTARY WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND TRANSLATION. By Sr. Mildred Dolores Tobin, C.S.C. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1945. Pp. xv + 143. $1.50.